This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

Digitized by Google

Library
of the
University of Wisconsin

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

WORKS

ON

EPISCOPACY.

VOL. II.

CONTAINING THE

SECOND SERIES OF DR. BOWDEN'S LETTERS TO DR. MILLER;

DR. COOKE'S ESSAY ON THE INVALIDITY OF PRESBYTERIAN ORDINATION;

AND

EPISCOPACY TESTED BY SCRIPTURE,

BY THE RIGHT REVEREND HENRY U. ONDERDONK, D. D.

NEW-YORK:

PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL PRESS.

MDCCCXXXI.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

CPAG 594202
.ON1
2

7/9/46 old Authors farm 350 2 vols.

A

SERIES OF LETTERS,

ADDRESSED TO

THE REVEREND DR. MILLER,

IN ANSWER

TO HIS CONTINUATION OF LETTERS CONCERNING THE CONSTITUTION AND ORDER OF THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY.

BY THE LATE

REVEREND JOHN BOWDEN, D.D.,

PROFESSOR OF MORAL PHILOSOPHY, LOGIC, AND BELLES LETTRES,
IN COLUMBIA COLLEGE. NEW-YORK.

SECOND EDITION.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

CONTENTS.

LETTER I.

Dr. Miller's *Continuation of Letters* strikingly destitute of propriety and civility—instanced in several particulars. Dr. Miller's charge that Dr. Bowden had forgotten his promise in referring to authors, proved to be groundless. Dr. Miller makes a great outcry against Dr. Bowden for beginning his proofs with the Fathers of the fourth century—this arrangement shown to be perfectly natural and proper—Dr. Miller declaims, instead of reasoning—asserts, without proving. He charges Dr. Bowden of being 'afraid to encounter Scripture alone'—shown not to have even a shadow to support it.—The ancients the best judges of the primitive government of the Christian Church—Dr. Miller totally misrepresents Dr. Bowden with respect to *Ruling Elders*—the proof given—Dr. Miller wholly inexcusable in this particular. 1

LETTER II.

Dr. Miller is very unfortunate in his assertion, that Dr. Bowden 'rushes to the conclusion, that different orders of the clergy were intended by a distinct enumeration'—Dr. Bowden relies on *things*, not on *names*—on the *powers exercised*, not on *titles*—The heathen noticed the pre-eminence of the Bishops, long before the empire became Christian—Dr. Miller required four proofs of Episcopal pre-eminence—they were given in great abundance—he does not notice this in his second work, but repeats the demand—a most disingenuous way of proceeding—the demand is, however, complied with—Dr. Miller denies that the ancients assert the apostolical institution of prelacy—proved by evidence irresistible—but if they did, he says, it would have no weight with him—this assertion, if correct, would take the fathers from us as witnesses to the canon of Scripture, and to the LORD's day. 11

LETTER III.

Dr. Miller derives no strength to his argument from the circumstance that the wine in the LORD's Supper was mixed with water—the fact is certain—no one denies it. The ancients believed that it was an apostolic usage, and there is sufficient evidence that it was—is used by the Scotch Episcopal Church—The practice of administering the communion to infants was very partial; therefore it wants *universality*, one of the marks of an apostolic usage—it cannot be traced to the apostolic age, and therefore it wants *antiquity*—consequently it must be rejected from the list of apostolic usages—Irenæus' mistake about the age of CHRIST, and the dispute about the time of keeping Easter, do not militate in the least against the testimony of the fathers to the divine origin of episcopacy—no reason can be assigned why Presbyterians at this time should be better able than the ancients to determine what the government of the primitive

Digitized by Google

Church was. Dr. Miller involves himself in absurdity and inconsistence—is guilty of a palpable evasion—does not venture to meet Dr. Bowden's proofs, but takes refuge in a play upon the word *Bishop*—Dr. Miller's objection, that there are difficulties attending the catalogues, is very weak—the very circumstance shows that episcopacy prevailed—the *Epistles of Ignatius* reconsidered, and proved to be episcopal—the government of the Churches of Jerusalem, Antioch, and Ephesus, proved to be diocesan. 19

LETTER IV.

Consideration of the *Ignatian Epistles* continued—Blondel makes a majority of power intrinsic to the notion of a fixed president—makes the apocalyptic *Angels* single persons—Dr. Miller denies that Blondel gives so early a date to episcopacy as the middle of the second century—proved from Blondel's own words, and from the provincial council of London—the best Presbyterian writers admit this early date—no parallel between the case of the twenty congregations in Edinburgh, and diocesan episcopacy—the notion of Tertullian's 'high priest' and Ignatius' 'Bishop' being no more than the moderator of a Presbytery, ridiculous. 32

LETTER V.

Jerome's testimony examined—proved to be in favour of the apostolic origin of episcopacy—Dr. Miller's assertion that there were six hundred Bishops in the council of Antioch, proved to be groundless—he mistranslates a passage in Eusebius, on which he relies. Dr. Miller's account of the provincial synod in Africa in the time of St. Augustine totally misrepresented—the case of St. Patrick planting congregational episcopacy in Ireland, ridiculous to excess—the story of a Metropolitan having six hundred Bishops in his district, without proof—Bishops in the time of Cyprian were not elected by the people—they only bore testimony to the character of the Bishop elect. 42

LETTER VI.

The Apostolical Canons proved by Beveridge to be authentic—Dr. Miller offers no proof to the contrary—Hilary's testimony in our favour—Chrysostom misrepresented as to Deacons—Basil misrepresented—one of the canons of the fourth Council of Carthage unfairly interpreted—The quotation from the sixth General Council of Constantinople, nothing to the purpose—The quotation from the Council of Aix la Chapelle (816) amounts to no more than a community of names, which is readily admitted. 56

LETTER VII.

The Bishops proved to be not the only ministers of the sacraments—To quote the thirtieth canon of the Council of Agatha is ridiculous—Presbyters never called *Bishops* after the apostolic age—Bishops the proper successors of the Apostles, according to the ancients—The presence of a Bishop in every worshipping assembly utterly inconsistent with matter of fact—The Bishop could not attend to every poor person within his charge—nor celebrate all the marriages, nor visit all the sick, nor instruct all the children—Jerome grossly mis-

Digitized by Google

represented—Deacons considered by the primitive Church as an order of the clergy—No change took place in the first three centuries in the powers of Bishops—The quotation from Hilary, in no view of it, affords Dr. Miller the least support—The fathers unanimous in favour of diocesan episcopacy. 65

LETTER VIII.

The testimony of the fathers to diocesan episcopacy decisive—Dr. Miller misrepresents Dr. Bowden with respect to the sufficiency of Scripture to determine the controversy—The genuineness and authenticity of the Scriptures cannot be determined without the testimony of the Church—Dr. Bowden rests his character as a divine on the reasoning of this Letter. 75

LETTER IX.

Dr. Miller's evidence for *Ruling Elders* examined, and proved to be insufficient—A wide difference between Ruling Elders, the *Vestry* of Episcopalians, and the *Committee* of Independents—The text for Ruling Elders examined, and proved to afford no evidence—Whitaker argues illogically—Proved from the New Testament that there was no distinction of Lay and Preaching Elders—It is inadmissible that two officers so essentially different as a Ruling and a Preaching Elder, should invariably be confounded under one common name—A capacity for teaching essential to an Elder—Dr. Miller inconsistant in beginning his testimony for Lay Elders in the fourth century, after he had censured Dr. Bowden for the same order. 81

LETTER X.

The quotations from the *Gesta* and from Hilary flat contradictions—Augustine bears no testimony to Ruling Elders—nor Cyprian—No mention of Lay Elders by the commentators or historians of antiquity—The institution cannot be supported by 'antiquity, universality, and general consent'—Eight important points of difference between the *Seniores Ecclesiæ* and Lay Elders—No distinction in the apostolic constitutions between Ruling and preaching Elders—Bishop Taylor a decided opposer of Ruling Elders—Not a shadow in Ignatius for them—Archbishop Whitgift rejects Scripture warrant for Ruling Elders—Guise is against the Elders of his own Church—Jerome, Eusebius, Tertullian, and Irenæus, give a list of Bishops up to the time of the Apostles, and give no hint that congregational episcopacy prevailed in the apostolic age, and diocesan in any subsequent age—No such change could have taken place in the second and third centuries, proved by several conclusive arguments—The prelatical character of Timothy and Titus established both from Scripture and the fathers—Dr. Mason admits their pre-eminence, but ascribes it to their character as Evangelists—The office of an *Evangelist* not extraordinary—That there were Elders at Ephesus and Crete before Timothy and Titus were sent to those places, proved from Scripture—The Church of Ephesus completely organized even upon presbyterian principles—Dr. Miller is in the region of fancy upon this point—No comparison can be instituted between the case of Timothy and that of Presbyterian Missionaries—Dr. Miller fails here *in toto*—Jerome, Eusebius, and the Council of Ephesus, bear testimony to the prelatical character of Timothy—Calvin's opinion of the text, *with the laying*

Digitized by Google

on of the hands of the Presbytery—Presbyterians who maintain the apostolic institution of Lay Elders, strikingly inconsistent in their reasoning, and in their manner of ordaining. 89

LETTER XI.

The texts relating to the *seven Angels* reviewed—The Presbytery cannot be represented by the Angel of the Church—A Star is never used in the sacred writings as a symbol of a plurality of ministers—Stars cannot represent Lay Elders, as they do not preach the word: consequently cannot be the representative of the Presbytery on Dr. Miller's principles—The Angel cannot be the Moderator of the Presbytery, because their respective relations are totally different—A Star is a proper symbol of an individual, when he is not the sole dispenser of light—proved from sacred and profane history—The Angels are addressed in the singular number—The Presbyterians cannot agree among themselves what sense to give to the Stars and to the Angels—Proof from fact that diocesan Bishops were settled in the seven Churches of Asia Minor, when the Revelations were written—Blondel not misrepresented by Dr. Bowden—The case of St. James, Bishop of Jerusalem, reviewed—*Calvin* quoted correctly—proved that he was a friend to prelacy—No sense given to Calvin's words which do not belong to them—The æra of Popery, according to Calvin, was the seventh century, in the time of Phocas—The superior jurisdiction of the Apostles was not founded on their extraordinary gifts, but on their commission—Dr. Miller's assertion that the Christian Church was formed on the model of the Jewish Synagogue, proved to be groundless. 121

LETTER XII.

Dr. Miller's observations on the opinions of *the Reformers* reviewed, and shown to be nugatory—The book entitled the *Erudition of a Christian Man*, in favour of prelacy—The notion which Dr. Miller says Presbyterians entertain, that a man is a Bishop when he has a pastoral charge, and but a Presbyter when he has not, quite new in ecclesiastical history—The opinions of the Reformers individually examined, and proved to be in favour of prelacy—The *Ordinal* affords a decisive and unanswerable proof, that the Reformers believed prelacy to be of divine origin. 147

LETTER XIII.

The *Waldenses* episcopal, proved by abundant evidence—The case of *Morrison* put on its proper ground—The Act passed in the thirteenth year of Elizabeth, reviewed—The *Church of Scotland* settled on the ground of imparity, placed beyond a doubt—Sufficient evidence that Luther preferred episcopacy to parity—Melancthon and Bucer also preferred it—Calvin's ordination and character reconsidered—The Church of England not Calvinistic in her doctrines—The Churches of *Sweden* and *Denmark* episcopal according to Mosheim and his translator Maclaine. 156

LETTER XIV.

Episcopacy was not introduced gradually after the apostolic age—The Church in the third century was not corrupt; but if it was, it affords no argument against episcopacy—The rise of *Metropolitans* in the second century presents no parallel to the origin of episcopacy—The question when Christianity was introduced into *Scotland*, considered—proved not to have been till the fifth century. 183

Digitized by Google

A SERIES OF LETTERS, &c.

LETTER I.

REV. SIR:

YOUR *Continuation of Letters concerning the Constitution and Order of the Christian Ministry*, has sufficiently engaged my attention to enable me to judge of its spirit, its decorum, and its weight of argument. Of its spirit, I cannot say much in commendation. It appears to me to be a spirit of resentment, and of a mind irritated by opposition. Of its decorum, I can say still less. It wants propriety and civility in a striking degree. And as to its weight of argument, it falls, in my judgment, much below your first publication. But general observations are of no material consequence; I shall, therefore, proceed to verify my assertions in a few instances.

There is, Sir, I am bold to say, a great want of propriety and civility in your *Continuation of Letters*. You tell me on more than one occasion, that 'I ought to blush.' Now, Sir, as blushing seldom accompanies a consciousness of integrity and propriety; and as I am not destitute of this consciousness, you must excuse me for not complying with your intimation. In order to justify your censure, you say,[a] that I charge you with 'contemptible cavilling;' with 'contemptible puerility;' with 'misrepresentations gross to excess;' with 'nonsense;' 'palpable nonsense;' and with your calling episcopacy an 'anti-christian usurpation.' Without running over my two volumes, (for you have not pointed to the pages) I take it for granted that you are perfectly correct. I then ask, Supposing it were possible for *you*, Sir, to cavil; when you do, what am I to say? What name should I give it? Should I say, the objection is *unreasonable?* Would this mend the matter? Might you not say, Dr. B. calls me an *unreasonable* man? When I apply the term 'puerility' to some of your reasonings, would it alter the case, and be more polite to say your argument is *weak?* If your argument is *weak*, and your objections *cavils*, and that to a great degree, is there any thing improper in applying to them the epithet 'contemptible?' If I

a Page 32 [239, 2d *ed.*]

Digitized by Google

had said that you are a contemptible man, or that you cavilled, perceiving it *to be* cavilling; or that you uttered puerilities, knowing them *to be* such; or that you laid down any position, involving in its consequences nonsense, being at the same time aware that *it was* nonsense, I should certainly be reprehensible. But when I had so liberally acknowledged your integrity, your good disposition, and your talents, I should really suppose that this, in conscience, is praise enough; and that you would never ascribe to your head, or to your heart, what I ascribe to nothing but arguments, hypotheses, or *supposed* facts.

But what makes this matter worse, you involve yourself in inconsistency also. You find fault with me for using terms which you deem offensive, when you yourself use terms much more so. You advise your people,[b] 'to forgive their' (the high-toned Episcopalians) 'uncharitableness,' and to 'pity their delusion.' This certainly means, that we are uncharitable and deluded men. Now, Sir, were it put to my choice, whether to be called a caviller, or one who utters puerilities or nonsense, or to be called an uncharitable man, I should prefer the former by many degrees; for *that* affects only the *head*, but *uncharitableness* affects the *heart;* and I had much rather be called a *weak* than a *bad* man.

Again: in the same page you say, we 'make claims nearly allied to the doctrines of Popish infallibility.' If this be true, we certainly speak nonsense; for infallibility in a mere creature, deserves no better name. And in your last volume,[c] you explicitly declare Prelacy to be a 'Popish doctrine,' and pronounce those who maintain it, *bigots.*[d] Was I not then warranted in saying, that you assert episcopacy to be an 'anti-christian usurpation?' Do you not ascribe its origin to Popery? And is not this *anti-christian?* And have you not conveyed this idea more than once in your *Letters?* What strange conduct is this! You wish to throw odium on me, for asserting that you consider episcopacy an 'anti-christian usurpation,' when your words will bear no other sense. Ah, my good Sir! how easy is it to see a *mote* in a brother's eye, and not perceive the *beam* in our own!

If then I have been indecorous in a few of my expressions, it is very certain that you have been much more so in several of yours. For you have really *called us names;* but I have not applied any thing reproachful to *you*, as a man, or a Christian. *We* are *uncharitable bigots;* and in return for this, I have acknowledged *you* to be a man of integrity, and free from any design of misrepresenting things, or of misleading the reader. This appears to me to be very like returning *good for evil.*[e]

---

b *Letters*, p. 19 [10, 2d *ed.*]
c *Continuation*, p. 427 481, 2d *ed.*]
d *Letters*, p. 286, 350.

e As the following anecdote is directly in point, and may amuse the reader, I take the liberty of presenting it. "Bilibaldus Pirckheimerus, the great friend of Erasmus, in a company where much was said in commendation of him, took notice that a certain Mendicant Monk discovered by his countenance and gestures, that he was greatly dissatisfied with the encomiums that passed; and being hard pushed to declare

Digitized by Google

Another circumstance which comes under the head of *decorum*, is your charging me with alluding to my own superior scholarship and reading. I could hardly believe my own eyes when I read this. What shadow have I given you for this assertion? You make it in page 384 [454, 2d *ed.*] after a long quotation from my second volume. I had been offering reasons, to show the moral impossibility of an early change from presbyterianism to episcopacy. Had I not a right to do so? Did not the point in hand require them? You certainly had no right to do any thing more than to show, if you were able, that my reasons were not well founded. But instead of that, you preface your observations with a declaration, that I affect a superior degree of learning and reading. There is not the least appearance of learning in the quotation; nothing but a few plain observations addressed to the common sense of my readers. What must people think of such conduct? and what apology can you make for such indecorum? Does it come well from a man who is so extremely sensible that he cannot bear to hear the word 'cavil' applied to the most frivolous objections, without expressing displeasure? *You*, forsooth! may intimate that I am vain and ostentatious of learning, when there is not a shadow to justify it; and you may call me *uncharitable*, a *bigot*, and an *abettor* of Popish doctrine; but not the least hint must be given by me, or any body else, that Dr. Miller can argue weakly, offer idle objections, or say any thing that does not imply profound sense. Pray, my good Sir, what entitles you to use such lofty language? Is it that you possess such pre-eminent talents, or that you have gained a victory? If these imaginations have raised you above your real standard, I must declare that I pity you.[f] And as I am bound, upon Christian principles, to be charitable, and hope for the best, I will ascribe these occasional swellings of heart to—*infirmity*; and then I can readily forgive you; for I also have my infirmities.

The next thing which I shall mention as coming under the head of *decorum*, is, your intimation of my want of command over my own temper. You say, 'It is exceedingly to be lamented, that gentlemen (Mr. How and Dr. B.) of their station should indulge in a style so scrupulously banished from all dignified

---

what he had to censure in Erasmus, he said, that this man whom they affected to extol so much, was a notorious eater of fowls; and that he knew it to be true, not from the testimony of others, but of his own eyes. Did Erasmus buy them or steal them? said Pirckheimer. He bought them; answered the Monk; it is the sin of gluttony: and it becomes the more heinous, when it is committed, and frequently repeated by churchmen. Perhaps, said Pirckheimer, he eats them on fast days. No, said the Monk; but we ecclesiastics ought to abstain upon all days from such delicacies. Ah, my good father, said Pirckheimer, it is not by eating bread that you have got that huge paunch of yours; and if all the fowls that have gone into it, could lift up their voice at once, and cackle in concert, they would make noise enough to drown the drums and trumpets of an army." The application is easy.

CHANDLER'S *Appeal further defended*, p. 165.

f The Doctor is full of pity towards us, as the reader will see in several passages of his *Letters*.

Digitized by Google

and polished society; that a person so long employed, as one of them has been, in forming the *moral* principles and character of youth, should discover so little success in the discipline of his own temper.' This is a charge which does not indicate much modesty or decency, and has no little appearance of a design to *injure*. *My* temper, it seems, is not well disciplined, because I have applied the terms 'cavil' and 'puerility' to some of your objections and arguments, and, in one instance, (I do not recollect more) the term 'nonsense' to a hypothesis, which evidently implies, in its consequences, a total want of consistency and sense. But *your* temper, no doubt, *is* well disciplined, although you use the term 'cavil' more than once,[g] and hold up to your readers Mr. How and myself, as *calumniators*,[h] as *uncharitable*, as *bigots*, as *abettors of Popish doctrine*. Some of these terms are personally injurious to us, and are therefore calculated to excite a high degree of indignation in our breasts. Yet from *your* pen they indicate nothing but "the milk of human nature."

I, Sir, expected no charge from you of using improper language, not only as yourself had used language much more unfit for 'polished and dignified society;' but also, as I had in the close of my work, bespoke your candour, and deprecated your displeasure at any improper expression that might have fallen from my pen, during the earnestness of a long controversy. My words are—'Although my patience has been severely tried by your manner of quoting authors, by several provoking hints and expressions, and by a management strikingly partial and unfair; yet, I hope that I have not been hurried into any transgression of decorum. I certainly wished, while I spoke plainly, to avoid every thing that would unnecessarily hurt your feelings. That I am faulty in this respect, I am not conscious; but if you, Sir, perceive any thing of the kind, point it out, and it shall be immediately retracted.' After having read this, were you as candid a man as you wish to be thought, you would not have charged me with indecorum, even if it had, in the heat of controversy, occurred in a small degree; especially, when you yourself were not immaculate on this point.

I must now settle one or two more accounts with you, before I come to your arguments.

You seem to be highly pleased, that I have, in four or five instances, transgressed a rule which I myself had prescribed. It relates to the manner of quoting authors, as will be seen by referring to my first volume, page 58.[i] When, Sir, you advert to the great number of quotations which I have made from Greek, Latin, and English authors, (the number is about three hundred and thirty) it will not be deemed strange that I should have been guilty of a few omissions; especially when you take into consideration the circumstances in which I wrote my letters,

---

g *Continuation*, p. 35, 83, [241, 271, 2d *ed.*]

h p. 55. [254, 2d *ed.*]

i Vol. I. p. 29, of this ed.]

Digitized by Google

as I have detailed them in the close of the work. My wonder is not, that I have been in a few instances negligent: but that I have not afforded you numerous instances for triumph. But while I acknowledge a trifling negligence in this particular, *you*, on the contrary, attempt to justify your conduct by a reason which is certainly a curiosity. Your justification shall be produced, after I have examined the instances, on which you ground your triumph.

The first instance you produce, is my quotation from Archbishop Usher's *Tract on Episcopacy*. Here indeed the page is not marked. But when you consider that all Usher says on the origin of episcopacy, is comprised in seventeen duodecimo pages (the rest of the tract being on other points) you certainly would have lost no time worth speaking of, had you begun the tract and read on to the eighth page, where you would have found the quotation. This then comes pretty well within the spirit of my own rule, the design of which is to prevent needless trouble to an opponent. I did not find fault with your neglect in this particular, for the sake of finding fault; but because it was a very serious inconvenience, as it needlessly wasted my time and spirits. For I can assure you, whatever you may think of the matter, that it sometimes cost me an hour, and sometimes more, to find a single quotation. Had not this been the case, I never should have noticed your omissions. But you are now finding fault, either from a captious disposition, or from a spirit of resentment; most probably from the latter.

Your next instance is in page 179 of your *Continuation*.[k] You observe, that I refer you to Jerome's *Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers*, without pointing to the page, and that the work 'is interpolated and suspicious.'

With respect to the latter particular, I will settle it with you in another place; but as to the former, I would appeal to the candour of our readers, whether, in *a catalogue*, there is any advantage in referring to the page, when nothing more is necessary than to turn to the *initial* of a person's name, and immediately you find the place you are in search of. Had you turned to the letter *P*, you would have found *Polycarp*, and, consequently, the words to which you were referred. This then I cannot acknowledge as a violation of my own rule.

The third instance of neglect which you note is in page 66 of my second volume.[l] It has a reference to a declaration of Luther's, to which I added a quotation from Melancthon. The authority I give is Dr. Chandler's *Appeal defended*, p. 239. Here I evidently intended to refer you to that page for both the quotations; for the conclusion of Luther's declaration, and the beginning of Melancthon's, stand upon the same line; so that you could not possibly perceive the one, without, at the same time, perceiving the other. What an instance is this of your

[k This charge is omitted in the 2d *ed.*]

[l Vol. I. p. 217 of this *ed.*]

Digitized by Google

candour! You really seem to be perpetually on the watch to catch at "trifles light as air." To this charge of negligence, therefore, I can by no means plead guilty.

The last instance (at least I do not see any more) you score up against me, is in page 410 of your *Continuation.*[m] It relates to my quotations from Chamier and Du Moulin. Although I have given the words, yet I have not given the reference.

Now, Sir, this arose from the concessions of these learned men being so notorious, and so often quoted, and even in the present controversy, that I did not think it worth while to give a reference. I could easily have done it, for I had my authority at hand. That authority is Sage's *Cyprianic Age vindicated*, page 67.[n]

Let us now sum up this account. My two volumes contain *three hundred and thirty* quotations; and out of this mass, *four* instances have been produced, in which I have not given a reference to the page of the author. Two of these instances, however, I do not admit; and the other two come fairly within the spirit of my own rule.

But this is not the point of view which I consider of the most importance. You may, if you please, add twenty more chalks to the score. I should not value it one straw. The circumstance to which I wish to turn my reader's attention, is simply this—Having prescribed a rule for conducting the controversy, as to a particular point, it is evident to common sense, that I would not violate my own rule *on purpose;* and candour would immediately say, this must be altogether owing to inattention. But nothing of this kind is plead by you. You did it *on purpose*, as you yourself tell us; for thus you endeavour to justify yourself—'I would ask this gentleman whether, in writing plain, didactic, pastoral addresses, such as my letters were intended to be, it is either customary, or proper, to attend with as much care to references, and to detail with as much exactness the history of every quotation, as in works of a controversial nature.'[o]

What an astonishing gloss is here given! Who that has not read your letters could possibly suppose, from your account, that they contain any thing but wholesome advice, practical instruction, and cordial exhortations to virtue and piety? Who would suppose that this was not their nature; but that, on the contrary, they are altogether controversial? And into whose head, Sir, do you suppose it ever entered, that a book, designed to prove episcopacy a usurpation, a corruption of the Church,

---

m [Page 471, 2d *ed.*]

n Inequalitatem esse vetustissimam ac vicinam Apostolorum temporibus, quod nos ultro fatemur. CHAM. Tom. II. lib. x. c. 6. § 24. as quoted by SAGE. Constitutum est statim post tempora Apostolorum, aut etiam eorum tempore, ut in una urbe, unus inter cæteros Presbyteros Episcopus vocaretur, qui in suos Collegas haberet præeminentiam, ad vitandam confusionem quæ ex equalitate nascitur. PET. MOLIN To. III, p. 179.

o *Continuation*, p. 28, 29. [The whole of this paragraph is omitted in Dr. M.'s 2d *ed.*]

Digitized by Google

a limb of Popery, would pass unnoticed? Is it possible that you could have thought so? If you entertained such an idea, you must have supposed that our clergy are a set of illiterate blockheads, or totally devoid of zeal for the honour and interests of their Church. No, no, Sir: You were at no loss to judge that your book would be answered. And how was a controversial work given to the public, and which was intended to impress on the minds of your readers, an idea of the corruption of the Episcopal Church, to be answered conveniently without references? I am sure I cannot, from my own experience, say *how*. This then is a miserably lame excuse; or rather, it is a weak, contemptible shift to get rid of a palpable impropriety.

I really, Sir, should not have ventured to pronounce myself so accurate in this particular, as your liberal and candid investigation proves me to be. I would have compounded for five times the number of omissions. But your kindness has relieved me; and I begin to feel confidence in my own minute attention.

There are two other particulars to be noted before I come to your arguments.

You have made, Sir, in your third letter, a dreadful outcry against my manner of arranging the testimonies and arguments exhibited against you. *You* began with the Scriptures. *I* began with the fathers of the fourth century. Against this mode, you enter your protest. You say,[p] 'Instead of assigning the Scripture the first and highest place; instead of beginning with it, and permitting it to stand upon its own proper eminence, he *begins* with the *fathers*. As if afraid of examining and exhibiting the testimonies of the fathers in their *natural order*, from the apostolical age downwards, he begins with the fathers of the fourth century; reasons backwards; assumes the corrupt principles and language of that age as genuine, and then employs them to interpret the primitive writers; and thus endeavours to make his readers believe that the order of the Church was the same in the *fourth*, that it had been in the *first* century; and that the words *Bishop*, *Elder*, *Deacon*, meant exactly the same thing in the days of Eusebius, Basil, and Jerome, that they had done in the days of the Apostles. I thank Dr. Bowden for the important concessions which this course of reasoning tacitly discloses. I thank him for the unwillingness which he discovers to encounter either the testimony of Scripture alone, or the testimony of the early fathers alone. His very *arrangement of evidence* speaks more than volumes. Of the *fairness* of this arrangement I say nothing. No reader of the smallest discernment wants a single remark to aid him in judging of this point. But I could scarcely have asked for a more humiliating confession of the weakness of his cause, and of his distressing consciousness that neither Scripture nor early antiquity will bear him out in his claims, than is to be found in this management, which he, no doubt, considered as a master-stroke of policy.'

p *Continuation*, p. 75. [p. 265, 2d *ed.*]

Digitized by Google

How easy is it to declaim! How hard to reason! How easy to make observations! How hard to make them to the purpose! Every sentence of this quotation is void of force; every sentence of it is calculated *ad captandum vulgus* [to catch the crowd.] Let us examine it.

You say, that I appear to be afraid of examining the fathers in their *natural order*. Pray, Sir, how are we to determine their *natural order*? *You* say, episcopacy had not an apostolic source. *I* say it had. You say that *a kind* of imparity began in the third century, and that episcopacy was not general even in the fourth. To prove that it was, I produce numerous testimonies from writers of that age, and from general councils, to which I add a variety of circumstances, enough, I think, to convince any man that it was universally the government of the Church at that time. This being secured, I inquire whether it originated in the third century. To prove that it did not, I exhibit numerous testimonies from individuals, and from provincial councils, to which I add some events that occurred, which I think completely evince that it had a much higher source. It remains then that it originated either in the second, or in the first century. I proceed, as usual, producing various testimonies, ending with those of Ignatius, to show that it did not take its rise in the second century. What now is the consequence? Infallibly, if I am right, that it had its source in the age of the Apostles. Accordingly, I show from Clemens Romanus, who lived in that age, and from the Scriptures fairly interpreted, (and the fairness of the interpretation is best determined by the immediate subsequent practice) that episcopacy flows from an apostolic source. And is not this method *natural*? I think it is perfectly so. We differ about the source of a river, the Rhine for instance. *I* say, it is evident from the map of the country, that it originates in the Alps. *You* say, from the very same map, that it originates somewhere below, but you cannot tell where. I propose to you to trace it from its mouth upwards. No, you say, that will never do; it is not the *natural order*. You must go at once to its source. I am very willing; but when we arrive there, you will not consider the marks that I give you of its source being in the Alps, as any marks at all; but rather the marks of another river. And thus we continue contradicting one another, when we might settle the point at once, by beginning at any given place lower down, and ascending to the head.

But it seems this is by no means *natural;* it is, however, in my estimation, you think, a 'master-stroke of policy.' Not very *masterly* that I can see. It is, if you *will* give it that name, *natural* and *correct* policy. Just such policy as you use when preaching; as a lawyer uses when pleading at the bar; and as an orator uses when speaking in a deliberative assembly. I take it for granted that you are well acquainted with the nature of the human mind, and with that arrangement of an argumentative discourse, which is best calculated to convince your hearers. Then

Digitized by Google

you certainly begin with the weakest evidences and arguments, and gradually ascend in a climax of reasoning, continually gathering strength, as you proceed, till at length you come forth in such an accumulation of argument, as subdues the most reluctant mind. Is not this *natural? I* think it is. *You*, it seems, do not. But why is it not? You give us no reason. It must then be because *you say so.* Oh, very well! that is a good reason.[q]

It seems too that I am *afraid* of encountering the arrangement you have prescribed—afraid of encountering the testimonies of Scripture alone; or the testimonies of the early fathers alone; that I manifest a 'distressing consciousness, that neither Scripture nor early antiquity will bear me out in my claims.' You really, Sir, have a fertile imagination. What is your proof that I am 'afraid of encountering Scripture alone?' Dr. B. has filled 'about thirty pages with what he calls his proofs that Timothy was a *diocesan* bishop.'[r] Second proof? No doubt it is, that Dr. B. has filled three pages with Scripture proofs that the angels in the Revelations were diocesans. Third proof? It must be in like manner, that Dr. B. fills three pages with proofs that St. James was Bishop of Jerusalem. Fourth proof? Dr. B. fills about eleven pages with Scripture proof, that the transaction at Antioch was not an *ordination.* Sum total from Scripture, *forty-seven pages.* Therefore, Dr. B. is afraid of Scripture *alone.* Admirable logic!

Let it be remembered that when I say, I have filled forty-seven pages with Scripture proofs, I include my *reasoning on* those proofs, which I have a right to do, and then my assertion is correct.

But why, Sir, are we to confine ourselves to Scripture *alone?* When the question is about a matter of fact, why are we not to take in the *whole* evidence relating to that fact? Did you ever know a judge on the bench prevent a lawyer from stating *all* his proofs of a matter of fact, and of his confining him to a *partial* statement, when the opposite party denied that statement? I presume not. Suppose, Sir, you were disputing with a seventh day Baptist about the change of the Sabbath to the first day of the week, how would you manage the debate? You are both agreed that the seventh day was originally set apart by God himself. He tells you, that there is no decree to be found in the New Testament annulling the old decree, and appointing the first day of the week instead of the seventh. You must necessarily say, 'I can produce no such decree, either by Christ or

---

p It is really very difficult to avoid treating an adversary with some degree of ridicule, who, in the most arbitrary manner, lays down his position as true, without the slightest reason in proof of its truth, and then, thinking that he rests on firm grounds, launches into the most offensive declamation, with a view to disgrace his opponent. In such a case, all that charity can say is,—It is to be hoped that he thought as he spoke.

r *Continuation*, p. 82. [p. 270, 2d *ed.*]

Digitized by Google

by his Apostles'; but you may indeed say, that you can produce something that has the appearance of intimation to that purpose. It is said four or five times, that the Christians met together on the first day of the week. But would he not reply, 'It is also said, they met together *every day*?' How then would you establish your point by quoting these intimations? You certainly would not succeed in the smallest degree. Should you farther say, that St. John, in the Revelations, declares that he *was in the* SPIRIT *on the* LORD'S *day*, might not your opponent ask, how do you prove that the 'LORD'S day' means any thing more than the day on which CHRIST rose from the dead? How do you prove that it means an alteration of the day for religious purposes? Sir, it is impossible for you to do it, *from Scripture alone*. You must have recourse to the unanimous testimony, and universal practice of the primitive Church; and this is enough to satisfy any unprejudiced mind. But were the Sabbatarian to talk as you do, he would say that "Dr. Miller is afraid to encounter Scripture alone; he, therefore, flies off to the fathers. He manifests 'a distressing consciousness' which 'speaks more than volumes,' that 'Scripture will not bear him out in his claims.' *He*, no doubt, considers the application to the fathers 'a master stroke of policy;' but *I* consider it by no means *natural*."

Now, Sir, although we think the evidence from Scripture *alone* in favour of episcopacy, tenfold greater than you can produce in favour of the change of the Sabbath; yet, as you find ways of evading all that we can say on that score alone, we think it highly reasonable to appeal to the primitive writers for a decision of this question. And if it appears from their verdict, that the government of the Church was episcopal, soon after the apostolic age, then we justly infer, that it is founded on apostolic authority. This must be your way of reasoning with respect to the change of the Sabbath; and why it should be deemed valid in one case, and not in the other, I cannot possibly conceive.

To conclude this point. It appears to me very improper that you should intimate, in the remotest manner, your disapprobation of my arrangement. I have a right to take my own way, as you have to take yours. All you have to do, is to answer what I have said.

Another particular which deserves to be mentioned, is, your misrepresentation of me in regard to *ruling Elders*. You say, 'Dr. B. perceiving that this position,' (the apostolic institution of these officers,) 'if maintained, would prove fatal to his cause, has endeavoured, with all his force, to drive me from it.'[p] Now, Sir, this is in direct opposition to my own statement. My words are, 'Were I to admit such an order, still the government of the Church might be placed under *Diocesans*. As Bishops have not the *sole* power in ecclesiastical affairs; as Presbyters are their counsellors and assistants in the administration of Church dis-

[p] *Continuation*, p. 118. [p. 292, 2d *ed.*]

Digitized by Google

cipline; so *ruling Elders*, even supposing them to have an equal share in the government with *preaching* Presbyters, would by no means invade the negative power of Bishops. Every congregation in this diocese might have two or three men of that order to assist the Rector of the Church with their advice in matters of discipline, and yet be all subject to the Bishop's supremacy. Episcopacy, then, is not at all affected by the decision of this question.'[t]

What now, Sir, can you possibly say for yourself? Have you not, with my first volume before your eyes, most grossly misrepresented my sentiments on this point? I say in the most express and unequivocal terms, that episcopacy is not at all affected by the question; and you declare that I perceived the position would prove fatal to my cause. Was there ever a greater outrage committed upon an opponent? Sir, this is too bad!

I have now done with miscellaneous observations, and shall proceed to examine, in my next letter, what *you* may possibly deem arguments in favour of your side of the question.

LETTER II.

REV. SIR:

FIRST—You say,[u] 'When Dr. B. finds Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons, mentioned separately, and distinguished from each other, in some of the early fathers, he never fails immediately to rush to the conclusion, that different orders, or ranks of clergy were intended by this distinct enumeration. But this conclusion is no less illogical and groundless than the former.'

This, Sir, is so far from being correct, that, on the contrary, I have always drawn my proof of episcopal superiority, not from the title, but from the powers exercised. I have repeatedly said, that there is no dependence to be placed upon *names*, but upon *things*. Thus, for instance, in the title *Bishop*, as it signifies an *overseer*, it is impossible *solely* from the word, to determine whether that title, in any particular case, is applied to the *overseer* of one congregation, or of a plurality of congregations. I was therefore particularly careful in every age, to ascertain first, whether *congregational*, or *diocesan* episcopacy, was the doctrine and practice of that age; and then, if the latter, I had a right to infer, that the distinction of Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons, implied different grades in the ministry. And thus I proceeded from the fourth age up to the first, concluding my proofs against *congregational* episcopacy, with the circumstances of the Churches of Antioch and Jerusalem, which so

t *Letter* VIII. [p. 95.]

u *Continuation*, p. 153. [p. 314, 2d *ed.*]

Digitized by Google

completely demolish the notion of a Bishop being the Pastor of a single congregation, that you, Sir, with all your speciousness, have not ventured to meddle with that point again.

What now, Sir, are we to think of your assertion, that 'I never fail to *rush* to the conclusion,' when there is a 'distinct enumeration of offices in the Church'? So far from 'rushing' to the conclusion, that I previously secured every inch of ground. Nay, even after I had demonstrated that *diocesan* episcopacy was the government of the Church in any particular age, still I did not come to the conclusion, that Bishops and Presbyters were distinct orders or grades, till I had first shown that Bishops possessed *powers* which Presbyters did not possess. Thus, I proved by numerous quotations, that St. Cyprian presided over several Presbyters, and several congregations; that he was raised *to the top of the Priesthood* (as he expresses himself) by a *new* ordination; his orders to the presbyterate being insufficient; that he had the *sole* power of ordaining and confirming, and the *supreme power* of the keys; no Presbyter having the power of administering the sacraments but in *subordination* to him; and from all these decisive marks I justly inferred, that a Bishop at that time was superior in *dignity*, in *power*, and in *order*, to a Presbyter. And to show you that this was not a solitary instance, I quoted the case of Cornelius, Bishop of Rome, as having also 'advanced gradually through all the inferior stations;' and that when he was promoted to that see, he was ordained, though a Presbyter, by sixteen Bishops. I also showed that, in the promotion of the Presbyter Sabinus to the episcopal dignity, he likewise was ordained by the imposition of the hands of the Bishops present. To these instances, I added the case of an ordination at Capsis, by six Bishops. I further added the instance of the schismatical ordination of Novatianus by three Bishops, and of Felicissimus, as anti-Bishop of Carthage, by five irregular Bishops.[v]

This, Sir, is *one* of the grand marks of a Bishop's superiority over a Presbyter, and *one* which you yourself called for in your first work, and which you again very modestly call for in your second. This is very unaccountable conduct. I really do not know how to proceed with such an opponent. If I give you ever so many proofs, you talk as if I had given you none. If I state facts on grounds that are impregnable, and draw from them the most logical inference, you tell me I am 'illogical.' If I proceed with the utmost caution, feeling every step of the way, you tell me that I 'rush to my conclusion.' In the name of patience, Sir, what am I to do with you? Will nothing satisfy you?

The superiority of Bishops over Presbyters being thus proved, in the third century, it settles the point that, when Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons are distinctly enumerated, the writers

v Vol. I. p. 96, 97. [p. 46, 47.]

Digitized by Google

meant to assert the superiority of Bishops over Presbyters at that time; and it also completely proves that, your notion of 'a *kind* of imparity' stealing into the Church in the third century, is a mere whim. There is another circumstance which deserves notice. It is, that this superior dignity of the Bishops is spoken of by all the writers of that age as a divine institution; and this is precisely the same thing as if they had said in so many words —No change has taken place in the essential orders of the Church since their first institution by the Apostles; and, consequently, this is a decisive condemnation of presbyterian parity.

Further: So far was I from 'rushing' to my conclusion, that I viewed this part of the controversy in every possible point of light, being perfectly aware of the shifts that might be used, had I left it in a vague, undetermined state. Nay, although the circumstance of a Bishop's receiving a new ordination is perfectly decisive, yet I did not rest the point of superiority even here. I demonstrated that no spiritual authority could be exercised in the Church but in subordination to the Bishop—that he had the supreme power of the keys—and that the validity of all acts of discipline depended upon him—that he was *Chief*, *Head*, *Master*, *Governor* of both Clergy and Laity; and, lastly, that he was the ordainer to the sacred ministry. All these points I have proved even to supererogation; and yet, with your story, I am for ever confounding two distinct things, *viz.* the distinct enumeration of the ministers of religion, with a distinction of orders, or grades of superiority. This is as far from the fact, as that you are an Episcopalian, or that I am a Presbyterian.

I mentioned in my first volume, that Bishops were called *colleagues* with one another, but not with Presbyters; and that they formed a distinct *college;* which, indeed, necessarily results from their being of a superior order. But this is utterly inconsistent with presbyterian parity. No Presbyterian *Moderator* can have, as a Bishop had, the supreme power of preserving the faith and unity of the Church—of admitting into, and excluding from the Church—of suspending, excommunicating, absolving, ordaining, degrading, deposing. Could any one possessed of such powers have been no more than a *Moderator?* Does not such a trust—does not being clothed with such eminence—prove a Bishop to have been *more*, *greater*, *higher*, than a Presbyter? —This is the way, Sir, I 'rushed' to my conclusion; and I am not at all surprised that you should have lavished hard names upon it; for in truth, it was all that you had in your power to do.

So glaring, Sir, was the pre-eminence of the Bishops, in every age of the Church, that even the *Heathen* took notice of it. St. Cyprian, in his 55th Epistle, tells Antoninus, that the Emperor Decius had such a spite against the Christian Bishops, that "he could have heard with greater patience that another prince had

Digitized by Google

set himself up as his rival in the empire, than that a Bishop should have been settled in the city of Rome." And Eusebius informs us, that "upwards of twenty years before the martyrdom of Cyprian, Maximin ordered that the *Archontes*, or chief rulers only, should be put to death."[w] And by consulting Eusebius, we find that this was the case up to the time of the Apostles. So manifest, so striking, was the superiority of Bishops over Presbyters.

Another of your masterly shifts to extricate yourself from this mass of evidence, is, that the age was corrupt, the clergy ambitious, and the people depraved. But admitting that they were, in a tenfold greater degree than you represent them, how does this help you? Still the facts were as I have stated them; still the testimony of Cyprian and many other Bishops proves *imparity*, great and striking, to have existed at that time in the Church; still the people and inferior clergy could see that they had a superior order of men ruling over them; still there were thousands of holy martyrs, and among them many Bishops, who shed their blood rather than deny their Master; still the Church was adorned with much piety and virtue; still, in short, there was common sense enough among Christians to know, that men clothed with such high powers, derived from thence superiority and pre-eminence, and that *parity*, however it was annihilated, did not exist in the Church in their day. Of what service then to you is the corruption of the age, were it even a fact?

Had you, Sir, considered with an impartial mind the accumulated evidence of the third century, it would seem impossible that you should entertain a doubt, whether episcopacy prevailed at that time. And you certainly would not have said in your last volume, with so much confidence, that 'the advocates for *diocesan* episcopacy, if they would derive any support to their cause from the writings of the fathers, must do what they have never yet done.'[x] You go on in the same strange and unaccountable manner—'They must produce from those venerable remains of antiquity, passages, which prove either by direct assertion, or fair inference, that the Bishops of the primitive Church were a *distinct order of clergy* from those Presbyters who were authorized to preach and administer the sacraments, and superior to them—that these Bishops, when they were advanced to this superior office, had a new and distinct ordination—that each Bishop had under him a number of congregations, with their Presbyters, whom he governed—that these Bishops were exclusively invested with the right of ordaining and administering the rite of Confirmation; and that this kind of episcopacy was considered by the whole primitive Church as an institution of JESUS CHRIST. When any *one* of these facts is fairly proved from early antiquity, the friends of presbyterian Church government will feel as if they had something like solid argument to combat with; but not till then.'

---

w EUSEB. *Eccles. Hist.* lib. vii. c. 13. x *Continuation*, p.151. [p. 313, 2d ed.]

Digitized by Google

Now, Sir, not only *one* of these facts has been proved, but *every one* of them, for the age we are at present concerned with. What purpose, what *fair* purpose, then, will these confident assertions answer! They will undoubtedly answer *your* purpose with your own people. You must very well know, that but few of them have read my work, or ever will read it. What, then, will the greater part of them say? Exactly this:—'Dr. Miller asserts, that the main points of the controversy have never been proved; no, *not one* point of it; and surely he is a wise and learned man; therefore he must know; and as he is a man of veracity, he certainly would not say what he knows to be false; therefore, I will entirely rely upon him.' This will be the impression made on Presbyterians by your totally groundless, and unwarrantably bold assertions.

The fact being thus as fully proved as any matter of fact ever was, that Bishops, in the third century, were an order superior to Presbyters, I shall take an earlier period in that century, and show, by reviewing the testimonies of Origen, that Bishops were a superior order from the very beginning of the century.

Of this celebrated man, I observed, in my fifth letter, that he was born in the year 186—that his father Leonidas was a convert to Christianity in the early part of the second century, and that he died a martyr to his religion; and, consequently, from these circumstances, was well qualified to instruct his son in the nature and constitution of the Christian Church; his own personal knowledge extending back almost to the apostolic age, and being, no doubt, acquainted with some who had lived in that age. I also observed that Origen was a man of the most extensive learning, and, therefore, well qualified to determine the question, whether episcopacy was an apostolic institution. I then gave two quotations from Origen. The first is that well known passage in his twentieth homily on St. Luke. The words are, "If JESUS CHRIST, the SON OF GOD, is subject to Joseph and Mary, shall not I be subject to the Bishop who is *by* GOD *ordained* to be my father? Shall not I be subject to the Presbyter, who, by the *divine* vouchsafement, is set over me?" Now, let it be remembered, that when Origen wrote this, he was a layman, and that he wrote it some time in the third century, probably about the year 220. And let it also be remembered, that it has been fully proved, that in the middle of this century *diocesan* episcopacy was the general government of the Church, and that Cyprian, and his contemporary Bishops, believed it to be of divine institution. Let it further be remembered, that the most learned Presbyterian writers have frankly conceded, that a full grown episcopacy prevailed in the third century, and some time before. Let these things be considered, and there cannot be the least doubt that Origen spoke and meant as all the writers of that age did speak and mean.

This quotation, then, proves the Bishop's superiority; and it also proves that Origen believed that superiority to be of *divine*

Digitized by Google

ordination; as we have shown St. Cyprian, and all his contemporaries, believed it to be.

Now, Sir, will your 'Moderator' answer the character of Origen's Bishop? The question, I confess, has much the appearance of an insult offered to your understanding; but your impartiality will, I trust, lay the blame where it ought to be laid; that is, upon yourself. You, no doubt, remember the explanation you give of Tertullian's High Priest. 'He might have been the *standing Moderator*,' you say. Then Origen's Bishop, and Cyprian's Bishop, 'might have been the *standing Moderators*.' Then Origen owned subjection to a character, with which, as such, he had not the least connexion; as a Moderator, he and the layman Origen bore not the slightest relation to one another; and yet he was to be subject to this *Moderator*, and that too by *divine ordination*. If the absurdity of this does not strike you, I do not know what absurdity will.

Another quotation from Origen which I gave you, is the following. "Besides these (the debts mentioned in the LORD's prayer) there is a debt peculiar to such as are widows maintained by the Church. And there is a debt peculiar to the Deacons; and another peculiar to Presbyters; but of all these peculiar debts, that which is due by the Bishop is the greatest. It is exacted by the SAVIOUR of the whole Church; and the Bishop must suffer severely for it, if it be not paid."

Here again, we have a distinct enumeration of officers in the Church in the time of Origen; and, consequently, according to the language and practice of that age, distinct grades, or orders of ministers. Allowing Origen to speak, as every man of sense does, according to the ideas annexed to words in his own time, it necessarily follows, that the Bishop was the superior officer. For it has been abundantly proved, that episcopacy was *diocesan* in that century; therefore, Origen's Bishop was a *diocesan;* and being so, he possessed all the superior powers of such a Bishop.

The very gradation of duties also proves a gradation of offices. For I ask, why was the duty of a Deacon less than that of a Presbyter? Surely, it was for no other reason than that he was an inferior officer, And for the very same reason, the duty of a Presbyter was less than that of a Bishop. The Deacon was less responsible than the Presbyter, and the Presbyter less responsible than the Bishop; consequently, the Bishop was the first officer in the Christian Church.

This is in perfect consistence with the language and practice of the third century. But your notion of a 'Moderator' is at utter variance with that language and practice; and when compared with the above quotation, absolutely ridiculous. Need I point it out again? Surely, I need not. The weakest understanding will readily perceive it.

Let it be remembered also, that the Church of Alexandria, to which Origen belonged, was *diocesan*, as I have fully proved in

Digitized by Google

my first volume; and then it will be evident that his language was that of a member of a *diocesan* Church.

These were the only quotations I gave you, referring you to Bishop Pearson's *Vindiciæ* for more. I will now add another out of several that I can produce.

Origen, in his Commentary on St. Matthew, says, that the Church was governed by Bishops, not only in his time, but that it had been governed by them for generations; which must reach the times, or nearly the times, of the Apostles. "There is a necessity," says he, "that we should depress the opinion of those who esteem themselves highly, because brought up under parents (προγόνοις) or progenitors, who had attained to that dignity in the Church as *to sit on the Bishop's throne*, or to have the honour of Presbyters or Deacons (to minister) to God's people." Here are distinct offices again; the Deacons subordinate to the Presbyter, the Presbyter to the Bishop, and the Bishop invested with the highest authority, expressed by *presiding on the throne.*

Will your *congregational* Bishop, or your Moderator, comport with this description? You may try it if you please; but I shall not give myself the trouble of writing a sentence to evince their inconsistence.

But it seems, that all the proofs which can be given for the establishment of diocesan episcopacy in the third century, you are determined to consider as of no manner of consequence. You say, 'What if Tertullian, Cyprian, Origen, Hilary, Epiphanius, Augustine, and a dozen more, who lived within the same period, could be brought to attest in the most unequivocal terms that prelacy existed in *their* time? Does any Presbyterian deny that clerical imparity had begun to appear in the third, and was established in the fourth century?'[a] Yes, Sir, I know one who has denied a part of this question, and that gentleman is yourself. You say in your eighth letter, 'The whole of that reasoning which confidently deduces the apostolic origin of prelacy, from its acknowledged and general, *but by no means universal prevalence in the fourth century*, is mere empty declamation.'[b]

Here you give prelacy but a *partial* establishment even in the fourth century; and you have, *in effect*, denied *imparity* at all in the third century, by endeavouring to make it appear that St. Cyprian was a *congregational* Bishop.[c] But let this pass; it is of no great consequence to point out your inconsistencies.

You go on to say—'But Dr. B. alledges that several of these writers expressly assert the *apostolical institution of prelacy.* Now if it were even true that they *do* make this assertion, it would weigh nothing with me, nor with any other reasonable

a *Continuation*, p. 189. [p. 236, 2d *ed.*] b *Letters*, p. 335. [p. 213, 2d *ed.*]
c *Letters*, p. 174 et sequent. [p. 116, 117, 2d *ed.*]

Digitized by Google

man.' (N. B.) You then give your reason for this chimerical opinion, which I shall consider presently.

Here, you deny that the above named fathers assert the apostolic institution of prelacy, and elsewhere, you positively affirm that they do not. After this, were you alone concerned, I should think it as useless to dispute with you, as with a man who looks at the blazing sun, and says it does not shine.

If any man can read the numerous, express, positive proofs that I have given, that a Bishop in the third century was raised to the "top of the Priesthood" by a *new* ordination, his ordination to the Presbyterate being insufficient—that he held the supreme power of the keys, and was the governor of all orders in the Church; and then will read the following testimonies given in my first volume, and yet assert that Cyprian and his contemporaries did not maintain the *divine right* of episcopacy, I must really think that he has a strange obliquity of thinking, and that he is proof against every degree of evidence from testimony.

Let it be remembered what sort of Bishop Cyprian is proved to have been, and then read as follows. At the opening of the council of Carthage he says, "Our LORD JESUS CHRIST, and he alone, has the power of setting Bishops over the Church, *to govern it.*" He says to Cornelius, that, "If the courage of Bishops be shaken, and they shall yield to the temerity of wicked schismatics, there will then be an end of the episcopal authority, and the sublime and *divine power* of governing the Church." And in the same epistle, he says, that "CHRIST *constitutes*, as well as protects Bishops." In his epistle to Florentius Pupianus, he says that, "It is GOD who makes Bishops;" and that "it is by the *divine appointment* a Bishop is set over the Church."[d]

I also proved, by a number of other testimonies, that it was the general belief of that age, that *diocesan* episcopacy is of divine *origin*.

Now, how do you free yourself from the embarrassment, in which these testimonies necessarily involve you? Not by showing that there are no such testimonies—not by showing that they do not imply what I have ascribed to them—not by evincing that *congregational* episcopacy was the government of the Church in that age, which would effectually render nugatory all that I have said; not by any of these means, but by boldly declaring that you do not value the testimonies of the fathers, nor ought they to be valued by any reasonable man.

You put me in mind, Sir, of what Goldsmith used to say of Dr. Johnson. "If in reasoning, you pin him up in a corner, so that you would think he could not possibly make his escape, he is sure to jump over your head, and run off." You have indeed got out of your straitened situation, but it is by running away from the question. You have got rid of a difficulty, but it is by

d See my fifth letter.

Digitized by Google

adopting an absurdity. You have deprived the fathers of common sense, but it is at the expense of your own. You have, in short, taken them from us as witnesses to the canon of the Scripture, to the LORD's day, and to any fact which took place before their own time. And what is your reason for all this? It is, it seems, because they were mistaken as to three facts, and therefore they are not to be depended upon for the government of the Church, one or two centuries before their own time. I fear this will deprive us of all history whatsoever.

With those facts I shall begin my next letter.

LETTER III.

REV. SIR:

THE first fact which you mention, as tending to invalidate the testimony of the fathers of the third and fourth centuries, is, that 'within fifty years after the apostolic age, the *wine* in the LORD's supper was constantly mixed with *water*. This mixture, considered at first as a measure of human prudence, soon began to be urged, not only as a matter of importance, but as a divine institution. Irenæus declares it to have been both taught and practised by our SAVIOUR himself. Lib. iv. cap. 57. Cyprian also asserts that the same thing was enjoined by tradition from the LORD, and made a part of the original institution.' You might likewise have added Justin Martyr, who mentions it as the custom of the Church in his time; that is, about thirty years after the death of St. John.[a] Clemens Alexandrinus also mentions it.[b] "But no Protestant now believes one or the other!!" Here you most grossly err. The Episcopal Church in Scotland believe it to have been practised by the Apostles, and by the whole primitive Church, and accordingly, invariably used the mixed cup. And the Church of England practised it till the second review of the Liturgy in the reign of Edward VI. at which time, by the influence of some foreign Presbyterians, they laid it aside, to the great regret of many learned and pious divines. And were you, Sir, to examine the evidence for this usage, I do not think you would find it an easy matter to show its insufficiency. As to myself, I can say, that after having considered the question with no small degree of attention, I am perfectly satisfied, that the Paschal cup, which the most learned in Jewish customs say was always mixed with water,[c] was the cup used by our SAVIOUR; and that it was the universal practice in the days of the Apostles, and for ages after. The testimony of Justin Martyr at Rome, of Irenæus at Lyons, of Clemens at Alex-

---

a *Apol.* II. p. 162. b *Pæd.* lib. ii. c. 2.
c LIGHTFOOT, *Hora Hebraica* in 1 Cor. xi. 25. et Matt. p. 298.

Digitized by Google

andria, of Cyprian at Carthage, and of numerous other subsequent writers, cannot be disregarded without serious consequences. But if it could, you must prove the practice not to have been founded on apostolic tradition, before you can infer any thing favourable to your purpose.

In my first volume, I gave you the rule of Vincentius Lirinensis for determining what are apostolic usages. It is, that such doctrines as we find to have been believed *in all places, at all times, and by all the faithful*, are derived from apostolic authority. Now try the use of the mixed cup by this rule. The practice was common in the early part of the second century; therefore, it has both antiquity and *universality*. The Paschal cup was used by our SAVIOUR, as appears from the Scripture, and that cup was mixed with water, as appears from Jewish documents; therefore, the subsequent practice was grounded on the SAVIOUR'S example; and thus we are at the source. If indeed the Church of the following ages had not used the mixed cup, we might consider it, like some other usages, as not designed to be continued. But when we find that it was universally used after our SAVIOUR'S example, however unimportant or insignificant, we may consider the circumstance; the usage comes within the rule of Vincentius, and therefore deserves belief. This case then will be of no manner of use to you.

Your second instance, viz. of giving communion to infants in the third century, has not one of the marks of Vincentius' rule. It was not a general practice in that century; but was confined to some Churches in Africa; therefore it wants *universality*. It cannot be traced to the apostolic age; and therefore it wants *antiquity:* and consequently it must be rejected from the list of apostolic usages.

But you say, 'Augustine calls it an apostolical tradition.' So he does, for the very reason which you mention—his misconception of John vi. 53. But who ever supposed that Augustine, or any other father, was an infallible interpreter of Scripture? You confound two distinct things, the *opinions* of the fathers, with their *testimony* to facts. A man may be erroneous in his opinions, and yet very correct in his statement of facts. Augustine does not say that the Church, in all ages and in all places, administered the communion to infants; but supposing it to be a Scripture doctrine, he considered it as obligatory. But he must have known very well, that even in his own time, (the fourth century) numbers differed from him, and that many Churches did not pay any regard to that African custom. His misconception, therefore, of a text of Scripture has nothing to do with the question we are discussing, viz. what weight has the opinion of the whole Christian Church in the third century, that episcopacy had a divine origin? *I* say it has great weight. *You* say it has none at all; and to prove it, you quote a partial usage in the third and fourth centuries, founded on a misconception. Then the argument stands thus: A few Churches in

Digitized by Google

those centuries founded, on a mistaken text of Scripture, a very simple, harmless, innocent rite; therefore all the Christian world in the third century are to be disregarded, when they found episcopacy on divine authority. Is there any logic in this? Is there any parallel between the origin of a rite, confined to a few, and this form of a government diffused over the whole earth? None, in any point of view whatever.

Your two next cases are worse than the preceding. Irenæus, it seems, thought our Saviour was fifty years of age when he was crucified; and this opinion he grounds on the question of the Jews, "Thou art not yet fifty years old, and hast thou seen Abraham?" And on the "testimony of all the old men who had lived with St. John, and the other Apostles." They must have been very old men indeed, who, in the time of Irenæus, had lived with *the other Apostles;* many years above a hundred. Irenæus himself did but just recollect St. John, whom, in his youth, he had seen. But he does not say that St. John had told him so; or that Polycarp, the disciple of St. John, had told him so. He heard it from some old men, who quoted that Apostle as the author of the report. Now, this carries weakness on the very face of it, and amounts to this—Irenæus suffered himself to be imposed upon. But does it follow, that he could not tell whether the system of ecclesiastical government had undergone a radical change between his time and the apostolic age? If it had undergone a change, he must have known it from thousands of witnesses; nay, he must have known it himself, for it must have happened in his own time. This, therefore, is too ridiculous to be mentioned.

Your next fact is the dispute about the time of keeping Easter. The Eastern Church plead the authority of St. John and St. Philip for their time of keeping the festival; the Church of Rome, the authority of St. Paul and St. Peter for their time of keeping it. Neither of them could possibly have been ignorant of the tradition with respect to this point. Polycarp, the disciple of St. John, knew very well the mind of the Apostle in this respect; and Anicetus, Bishop of Rome, knew very well what had been the practice of his own Church. Both parties had therefore the best authority for what they did. Now, what is the fair inference from this statement? Certainly, that the Apostles acted in this matter from their own private judgment, and not from a *divine* direction. It is universally acknowledged, that several apostolic usages are not binding, because the Apostles, in such cases, did not act on the ground of divine authority. The office of Deaconesses was not considered by the primitive Church as a permanent institution, and therefore, when it was abused it was laid aside. In like manner, the love feasts were dropped, because they also had been abused. Some other apostolic usages were likewise given up; but these need not be named, as those mentioned are sufficient. We must judge of the obligatory power of apostolical practices from their

Digitized by Google

nature, and the circumstances of the times. What became useless from a change of circumstances, or what could not be carried into effect with propriety and decency, was wisely laid aside by the primitive Church. Festivals are entirely of this nature. Different Churches acted in respect to them as they thought proper: hence arose a variety of practices, which were perfectly consistent with keeping *the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace.*

From this short, and I believe correct view of the subject, the disputants on this question were both right as to *apostolic* sanction; but it does not appear that either party plead a *divine* sanction. Accordingly, Polycarp and Anicetus communed together in Christian charity, and agreed to continue their respective practice. This therefore is a case that cannot in any respect answer your purpose; nay, it directly makes against you. For here the source of the practice was clearly ascertained; but the circumstance of the time, and even the festival itself, not being *divinely* appointed, there was room for a difference of usage.

And now, it may be proper before I proceed, just to observe, what a strong argument this case affords against the supposition that the constitution of the Christian Church underwent in the early ages a material change, when those who must have been concerned in it were so extremely tenacious of apostolic usages, even when they were not of a binding nature. A change of this kind is so improbable, so unreasonable, and so directly contrary to principle, and to the influence which attachment has over the human mind, that nothing short of direct and positive evidence can induce the mind to acquiesce in it.

And now, Sir, I will give you reasons why the testimonies of the third century, in favour of the apostolic origin of episcopacy, should be deemed conclusive.

1. A century or [illegible] more, is but a short time to trace back any government, whether civil or ecclesiastical. It does not appear to me that any reasonable man can deny this. Neither you nor I can be at the least loss to determine, beyond all contradiction, what was the government of our respective Churches two hundred years ago. If *we* have records by which we can do it, so had the fathers. If no material change could have taken place in that time in our Churches without our knowing it, surely the same may be said of them. If your General Assembly could not possibly convince the world, that episcopacy was not the government of the Church of England a century or two ago; or if our General Convention could not possibly convince the world, that presbytery was not the government of the Church of Geneva at either of those periods, certainly the writers of the third century could never have convinced the Christians of that age, that episcopacy was an apostolic institution, if it really was not so, or if it had been disbelieved in the second century. And as there are many men of sense and

Digitized by Google

integrity in your General Assembly, and our General Convention, it can never be supposed, without folly, that so weak and wicked an attempt would be made by them. In like manner, it can never be supposed, without folly, that the pious and sensible writers of the third century, many of whom shed their blood for their SAVIOUR, would attempt what we, who have neither more sense nor more piety than they had, would deem folly and wickedness. Nor is there any other possible light, according to my apprehension, in which this point can be viewed. If the writers of the third century made a mistake in this particular, they could not have been men of common sense; if they intended to impose upon the world, they could not have been men of common honesty. It will not do to say, they might have been innocently deceived as to the origin of episcopacy. Then they wanted common sense; and consequently their testimony to the canon of Scripture, or to any fact whatever, is not worth a straw; and to say that they wanted honesty, would be a very strong proof with me of a want of honesty in the person who made the assertion.

2. I should be glad to know how it happens, that Presbyterians, in the present day, are better able to determine what the original constitution of the Church was, than the writers of the third century. If it be true that Presbyterians at this time are better able, there certainly must be some reason for it. What is it? Is it that Presbyterians possess more zeal than *martyrs* and *confessors;* or more light, more learning, more piety, more probity? Do you, Sir, and Dr. Mason, and Dr. M'Leod, and a hundred other Doctors, possess greater advantages for knowing what was the government of the Church in the apostolic age, than Cornelius, and Fabius, and Origen, and Dionysius, and Firmilian, and St. Cyprian, and many others? If you say you do, you certainly are not overstocked with modesty; and if you say you do not, then solely on the ground of better information, their testimonies are beyond all comparison superior to yours. What is it then that gives Presbyterians such an advantage over the ancients? It is beyond my conception; and if they will not tell us, we must conclude that they have no advantage whatever.

3. The fact is, that the ancients had much greater advantages for determining this, and every other important matter of fact relating to the Church, than we can possibly have. They had not only all the writings that we have, but a great many more. "They had a great number of Epistles written by Synods to Synods, by Bishops to Bishops, by Churches to Churches, about all things that happened, in which either the government or the discipline of the Church was interested. By all which monuments and records, they might have as fully learned what was the government instituted by the Apostles, and whether *substantial* innovations had been made in it, as we can learn by the records of the fifth and sixth centuries, what the form of government was in those centuries."

Digitized by Google

Besides these advantages, "in the records of those times, we have frequent instances of persons who might have handed down the tradition with the greatest security. Thus, for example, it is uncontroverted that Irenæus was so much contemporary with Polycarp, and with Pothinus (his own immediate predecessor) in the episcopal chair of Lyons, that he not only might, but did actually learn from them what form of government the Apostles settled in the Churches. Both, of their own proper knowledge, were capable to have taught him. According to the most accurate accounts, Polycarp, aged 89, died *anno* 147. By consequence, he was born *anno* 61, that is, he was aged thirty-nine years before St. John's death; nay, it is as certain as history can make it, that he was consecrated Bishop of Smyrna by that Apostle. Pothinus was aged 90 when he was raised to the glory of martyrdom, *anno* 167. He was then born *anno* 77, and aged 23 when St. John died. Irenæus, aged 50 before the death of Polycarp, and 70 before the death of Pothinus, lived at least till the year 190. And what could have hindered a third to have received the accounts from him, which he received from Polycarp and Pothinus, and to have lived till St. Cyprian was made Bishop of Carthage?"

Again: "Alexander, Bishop of Jerusalem, (who did not die before the year 250,) according to the common reckoning, was chosen assistant to Narcissus, Bishop of that see, about the year 212. And if he was then capable of administering the episcopal office, I hope he was capable of comprehending such accounts as Narcissus was able to give him. Narcissus was aged then about 116, as Alexander tells us in his epistle, of which we have a fragment in Eusebius. By consequence, he was contemporary with thousands who were contemporary with St. John, and might have been contemporary with hundreds who were St. Peter and St. Paul's contemporaries."[d] History will furnish many other such instances.

But notwithstanding all these reasons, you still persist in the opinion, that the writers of the third century ought not to be regarded by any reasonable man. But this opinion, so contrary to the established rules of historical evidence, and to the common sense of mankind, you yourself fly from, when you think you can gain some advantage by it. You quote a number of writers in the third and fourth ages, and even later, after explicitly declaring that the testimonies of those ages deserve no regard. What do you call this?

Not contented with involving yourself in absurdity and inconsistency, you have recourse to one of the most palpable, gross fallacies, that I have ever seen from the pen of a writer. You say, 'it is not true that any one of the fathers within the first four centuries does assert the apostolical institution of Prelacy.' And after bringing to our view again several of my quotations,

---

d SAGE'S *Cyprianic Age Vindicated*, p. 19, 20, 21, 22.

Digitized by Google

which are express to the purpose, you proceed: 'Now is it possible that Dr. B., after devoting the best powers of his mind for thirty years, to this controversy, has yet to learn that all these quotations, and ten thousand more like them, are nothing to his purpose? Have not I, who am a Presbyterian, repeatedly said, in the foregoing sheets, that Bishops were, by *divine appointment*, set over the Church? Do not Presbyterians perpetually speak of the office of Bishop in their Church, as a sacred office?'[e] Now here lies the fallacy. I had previously proved by evidence so overwhelming, that you have not ventured to meddle with it, that Bishops, in the third century, were *diocesan;* that they were raised from the *presbyterate* to the *episcopate* by a new ordination; that they possessed the *supreme* power of the keys; that they were the *sole* ordainers; that they *alone* confirmed; that all orders in the Church were *subordinate* to them; and that Bishops of this kind were instituted by CHRIST. After I had done all this, you very coolly tell me, that you and all Presbyterians believe in Bishops by divine appointment. Palpable evasion! What sort of Bishops do you mean? Not mine, surely; for that would be giving up the point. No; but *congregational* Bishops. I have proved to a demonstration, that episcopacy was *diocesan* in the third century, and that the writers of that age believed *it* to be of *divine appointment.* You believe that *congregational* episcopacy is of *divine origin;* therefore, diocesan episcopacy was not the government of the Church in the third century. What contemptible reasoning is this! It is a gross fallacy, a mere begging of the question. Your business was to show that I had failed in my evidence for diocesan episcopacy; and then of course, congregational episcopacy was that to which the writers of the third century ascribed a divine origin. But instead of doing this, you fly from the question; you do not attempt to meet it; you dare not meet it. Sophistry is your refuge; a play upon the word 'Bishop' is your retreat. This is too bad from one who professes to reason; too bad for one who professes to give a luminous view of the nature and constitution of the Christian Church. Does it not then deserve contempt?

I think it must now be evident, that Prelacy prevailed in every part of the third century, and, consequently, if any change took place, it must have been in the second century; and then it must have been effected so invisibly, that it was not possible for human eyes to perceive it. Can you, Sir, believe this?

In ascending from the time of Origen, I took notice of the testimonies of Tertullian, Clemens Alexandrinus, Irenæus, and St. Ignatius. With respect to the two former, as they lived both in the second and third centuries, they are good witnesses for both those periods. And as it is incontestibly proved that *diocesan* episcopacy was the government of the Church in the time of Origen,

e *Continuation*, p. 193, 194. [p. 389, 2d *ed.*]

Digitized by Google

and as Tertullian and Clemens were his contemporaries, I have an undoubted right, whenever I meet in their writings with an enumeration of the offices of the Church, to consider them as bearing testimony to three distinct grades or orders. For it is utterly inconsistent with reason, and with every rule by which the judgment ought to be governed, to suppose that Bishops (when it is once settled by incontrovertible evidence, that they were raised to the "top of the priesthood," by a distinct ordination from that of a Presbyter) were not superior in power and dignity: for that would be to give them nothing which they did not possess before.

In my first volume,[f] I quoted Tertullian saying, "The chief Priest, who is the Bishop, has the right of giving baptism, and after him, the Presbyters and Deacons, but not without the Bishop's authority." Here the three orders are enumerated, and therefore, according to the principles of the third century, which have been proved to be prelatical in the full sense of the word, Bishops were an order superior to Presbyters and Deacons. Tertullian also calls the Bishop the chief priest; consequently, the Presbyters or Priests were inferior to him, unless it can be proved that *chief* means the same thing as *equal*. And he further says, that the power to administer baptism, and consequently the other sacrament, is derived from him. Here then it is evident, that the right of ministering in holy things, is entirely owing to authority derived from the Bishop; or, in other words, that no ordination could be performed but by him. Thus the Bishop's authority is affirmed by Tertullian, in perfect conformity with Cyprian and his contemporary Bishops.

In answer to this testimony from Tertullian, you observed, 'The highest priest might have been the *standing Moderator* of the presbytery.' To this I replied, '*might have been!*' Is this reasoning? Especially after I had proved to a certainty, that in the age of Tertullian, *diocesan* episcopacy was universally the government of the Church, and that Bishops were raised to the "top of the priesthood" by a new ordination. I further asked—"Has a Moderator among you the supreme power of the keys? Do the members of your presbytery derive the power of administering the sacraments from him? Can they not administer them but in subordination to him? How preposterous it is to suppose that your *Moderator*, even if he were to hold his office for life, would answer to Tertullian's 'High Priest' or *Bishop*? All the essential traits of character in the *latter*, are totally wanting in the *former*."

Tertullian also traces these Bishops, or 'high Priests,' up to the Apostles. "In this manner," says he, "the apostolic Churches bring down their registers; as the Church of Smyrna from Polycarp, placed there by John; the Church of Rome from Clement, ordained by Peter; and so do the rest prove their apostolic origin by exhibiting those who were constituted their

f Page 142. [Vol. I. p. 69.]

Digitized by Google

Bishops by the Apostles."[g] Here Tertullian's High Priests, who authorized Presbyters to administer the sacraments, and who were, therefore, necessarily their superiors, are declared by him to be of apostolic origin; and yet you deny that any father ascribes prelacy to apostolic institution. Pray, Sir, was not the 'high Priest' a Prelate? Is not, for the same reason, the High Priest of the Catholic Church a Prelate? Does not Tertullian ascribe to him powers superior to those of a Presbyter? Have I not fully proved from Cyprian and others, that, in their time, this High Priest had a distinct ordination; that he alone had the right of confirmation and ordination; that he was supreme in the government of the Church; and that such Bishops or High Priests formed a distinct college, and had definitive voices in all councils? And can any marks of prelacy be stronger than these? Where can you find a Prelate, if one endowed with these powers is not entitled to the character? Is Tertullian to be considered as not knowing any thing of the government of the Church in his own time? Or did this full grown prelacy spring up eight or ten years after Tertullian's death? If so, what shameless wretches were Cyprian and all the Bishops of his time, to assert that this high-toned prelacy was of apostolic institution? And what idiots were the thousands under their government to believe them, when for years they had seen a totally different regimen? Is it possible for any man of common sense to adopt this?

You indeed object that this notion of a *single* succession is not to be depended upon, because there are some difficulties in the catalogues. But this is not true with respect to the catalogues of Jerusalem and Alexandria. It is only with respect to those of Rome and Antioch that there is a difficulty, but which Dr. Hammond has, I think, fairly settled. But let it be otherwise, if you please. Then I ask, are there not also difficulties in the catalogues of the Jewish High Priests? But who ever, on that account, supposed that there was an interruption of that office in the Jewish Church? Are there not difficulties likewise in the catalogues of the *Archontes* of the Athenians? Yet nobody ever doubted that there was a succession of *Archontes* from Creon.

The answer of Charles I. to this objection would, I think, to an unprejudiced mind, prove completely satisfactory. "All human histories," says he, "are subject to such frailties. There are differences in historiographers in reciting the succession of the Babylonian, Persian, and Macedonian Kings, and of the Saxon Kings in England. And we find more inextricable difficulties in the *Fasti Consulares*, (the catalogues of the Roman Consuls,) notwithstanding their great care in keeping the public records, and the exactness of the Roman histories, than are to be found in the episcopal catalogues, &c. Yet all men believe

g Letters, Vol. I. p. 145. [Vol. I. p. 70, 71.]

Digitized by Google

there were Kings in those countries, and Consuls in Rome in those times. So that the discrediting of the catalogues of Bishops, in respect of some uncertainty and differences, which yet may be fairly reconciled, tendeth rather to the confirmation of the thing itself."[h]

There is no possible way for you to get rid of the testimony of Tertullian, Cyprian, and all the writers of their age, but by showing that it does not necessarily follow that the Bishop, from the circumstances mentioned, is superior in dignity and power to the Presbyter. But as that would be a palpable absurdity, you will not, I think, very readily undertake it. You must, therefore, for any thing I can see, remain contented to have these testimonies placed against you.

Thus, Sir, by feeling every inch of my way, I 'rush' to the conclusion, that in every part of the third century, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, were distinct orders in the Christian Church. And if so, then the distinction of orders, if it did not take place in the apostolic age, must have taken place in the second century. Let us try this point.

And here, to shorten the business, I will pass over all the testimonies I adduced between the close of the second age and the time of Ignatius, referring my readers to the first volume of my work for what I have quoted during that period.

You persist, in your last publication, to maintain that the epistles of Ignatius do not favour *our*, but *your* side of the question. I prefaced my quotations from Ignatius with the following observations—'It is, Sir, to me very unaccountable, that Blondel, Salmasius, and Daille, should have laboured so hard to invalidate these epistles, when they are, if you are right, so clearly on their side of the question. To them they must have appeared in a very different point of light from what they do to you. If they had not been convinced that they were too Episcopal for them to manage, they would have admitted them, and reasoned from them in favour of presbytery. This would have been *argumentum ad hominem*, which would effectually have shut the mouth of every Episcopalian. But no; they did not choose to try that experiment.'

With this opinion the learned Grotius concurs. I quoted him saying—"The Epistles of Ignatius, which your son brought out of Italy, pure from all those things which the *learned* have hitherto suspected [in the *larger epistles*,] Blondel will not admit, because they afford a clear testimony to the antiquity of episcopacy."[i] 'And the learned Mosheim acknowledges, although at the expense of consistency, that there would have been no dispute about those epistles, had they been silent on the point of episcopacy.'[k]

This, I acknowledge, is not a logical proof that *you* are wrong,

---

h *Final Answer*, &c. See his Works, p. 641.
i Vol. I. p. 179. [Vol. I. p. 85.] k *Ibid.*

Digitized by Google

and that *they* are right; but it certainly affords a strong presumption against you. Had these men been Episcopalians, the case would be different: but when they were labouring hard against episcopacy, and yet acknowledge that Ignatius is no friend to *parity*, it must, I think, be admitted, that it presents a difficulty not very favourable to your judgment. But let us cut the matter short, and appeal to the epistles themselves.

You admit that Ignatius invariably speaks of three sorts of officers in the Christian Church in his time, Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons. The very enumeration of these officers affords evidence that there was a difference of some sort or other; for if there was no difference, it is impossible to give a reason why they should be distinctly enumerated. All the difference you make, is, that the Bishop was the *Rector*, or Pastor, and the Presbyters his *curates*, or assistants. Your words are, 'We have satisfactory proof that there were in the primitive Church, clergymen in full orders, that is, empowered to preach and administer sacraments, who yet had no pastoral charge, but acted the part of assistants or curates to the Pastor, Rector, or Bishop. Now, in what manner could such be distinguished from those who were invested with a pastoral charge, but by calling the one class Bishops, and the other Presbyters? In the Presbyterian Church, we distinguish them in this manner; and in the Church of England, they distinguish them by calling the former Rectors, and the latter Curates. And with just as much reason might some person five hundred years hence, assert that Pastors and assistant Presbyters, or Rectors and Curates, were different orders of clergy in the eighteenth century, as Dr. B. can now insist that Bishops and Presbyters were different orders in the primitive Church. The argument is totally delusive; nor could it have been so often and so gravely repeated, had there not been, on the part of those who have urged it, a miserable deficiency of sounder proof."[1]

Well, Sir! now we know where to find you. Only adhere to this, and the dispute will soon be brought to an end.

Here we have it from under your own hand, that in the time of Ignatius, that is, in the beginning of the second century, a Church consisted of a Bishop, or Pastor, or Rector, with a plurality of assistants or curates; and consequently of a plurality of congregations; and that the title of Bishop was conferred upon the proper pastor to distinguish him from his Presbyters or assistants.

To this I answer, first, Let it be kept in mind that Ignatius says, "without a Bishop, Presbyters, and Deacons, there is no Church named;" and consequently, it was the universal government.

And is it really so, that among Presbyterians there can be no Church named, which has not the above plurality of officers?

1 *Continuation*, p. 153, 154. [p. 314, 2d *ed.*]

Digitized by Google

Is that the case with the Church whose pastor you are? Perhaps you will say, Yes; we have Ruling Elders. But Ignatius does not say a word about Ruling Elders, and therefore you have no right to foist them in among his Presbyters. Besides, I will show directly that they were Presbyters who administered the sacraments. But were I even to admit that *some* of the Presbyters did not minister in holy things, still it would be of no service to you, for I have proved from Scripture alone, that there must have been numerous congregations at Antioch, and consequently numerous preaching Presbyters in that city. Making then every allowance, the plan of government in the church of which you are the pastor, is very different from that of Ignatius.

Further; you have entirely precluded yourself from the benefit of Ruling Elders in the above quotation; for you say that the Presbyters were the assistants of the Bishop, or what is equivalent in the Church of England, Curates to the Rector. But who ever heard of Curates being Ruling Elders?

But perhaps three or four associated churches will come nearer to the Ignatian pattern. For instance, your two churches, which have been lately separated. Before that period, who was the Bishop? Dr. Rodgers, or Dr. M'Knight, or Dr. Miller? Did you, or any body else, ever consider the venerable and pious Dr. Rodgers the Bishop, and yourself and Dr. M'Knight merely his assistants or Curates? Or did the good old gentleman in your church-sessions always take the Moderator's chair *ex-officio*, as a matter of right? Was he, in short, the *standing Moderator?* If you cannot answer these questions in the affirmative, and I am persuaded you cannot, then a Presbyterian Bishop, and the Bishop of Ignatius, were very different things.

It seems then that, whether we consider you as the Bishop of a single congregation *with* or *without* an assistant, you are not an Ignatian Bishop, who had numerous congregations, and numerous Presbyters under him; or whether we consider you as a minister associated with two or three others, you are not a Bishop of the primitive stamp; for we find that kind of Bishop was the *standing Moderator* of the Presbytery, to whom all ranks were to be subject in spiritual matters; who was the principal of unity to a hundred Presbyters and a hundred congregations, if there were so many under him.

Take we another instance—the Church of Jerusalem, the first Christian Church that was formed, and let us see whether presbyterian Church government is consistent with that. I proved from the holy Scriptures that there were many myriads of Christians in that Church. Mr. M'Leod says fifty thousand, and I believe he is not out of the way, unless it be in under-rating; for the expression *many myriads* fully justifies his calculation. Then there must have been at the very lowest a hundred congregations; for they had no large buildings at that time to meet in. Now all antiquity says that St. James was *the* Bishop of

Digitized by Google

Jerusalem, and according to your plan, because he was the proper Pastor of these numerous congregations and numerous Presbyters. Is this presbyterian government, or any thing like it? Or was St. James with a multiplicity of congregations and Presbyters, like a Rector of the Church of England with his Curate?

Let us next consider the Church of Ephesus, where St. Paul laboured for the space of three years, and where he tells us "a great door and effectual was opened" to him. No one can doubt that there were several congregations, both of converted Jews and Gentiles, in that city; and we read of a plurality of Elders, who are also called Bishops. By this application of the title you are effectually precluded from mixing any Ruling Elders among them, for all that are called Bishops most certainly preached and administered the sacraments, and you must necessarily admit it upon your own principles. Now, Sir, if the plan of Church government which you laid down in the above quotation for the purest and best ages, places a flock consisting of a plurality of congregations under a Bishop or Rector, with his assistants or curates, who, I ask, was *the* Bishop of Ephesus? For all the Presbyters are called Bishops. How then was the Pastor or Rector distinguished from his assistants or Curates? The word Bishop would not answer the purpose, for the title belonged to all. You must then either admit that there was no Pastor over that numerous flock, when at the same time there were several Presbyters or Bishops, which would be a strange thing indeed, and if not strange, inconsistent with your plan, which requires a Bishop or Rector to preside over several assistants or Curates; or else you must admit the independent system, which would both contravene your purpose and historical fact; it being universally admitted, that there were at that time no *tituli*, or appropriations of a particular Presbyter to a particular congregation. I really do not see how you can extricate yourself; for I take it for granted that you will not call in Timothy to help you, although he would settle the matter with the utmost facility.

It being then evident, that your scheme of Church government does not accord with the three great instances of the Churches of Jerusalem, Antioch, and Ephesus, we had better let Ignatius speak for himself.

Digitized by Google

LETTER IV.

REV. SIR:

WE are now to let Ignatius speak for himself.

1st. To show that he thought himself possessed of the apostolic pre-eminence, he salutes the Church of the Trallians in the fulness of the Apostolical character, and then says, "Be subject to your Bishop as to the LORD, and to the Presbyters as to the Apostles of CHRIST; likewise the Deacons also, being ministers of the mysteries of CHRIST, ought to please in all things. Without these there can be no Church of the elect," or of Christians. Here is a great and manifest difference between the Bishop and his Presbyters. Ignatius supposed the Bishop to be the proper representative of CHRIST, while the Presbyters who did not represent him were in an inferior degree, and therefore to be reverenced only as the Apostles. And this surely proves a great inferiority of the one to the other. It is observable, that when Ignatius speaks of the Bishop's being the vicegerent of GOD, or of CHRIST, in order to preserve some kind of analogy and proportion, he speaks of the Presbyters holding the second grade, as the Apostles did under CHRIST; but not with any design to intimate that Presbyters succeeded to the plenitude of the Apostolical character; for that he always attributes to the Bishop, when he does not mean to illustrate analogically the different degrees or orders of the Christian ministry.

2d. In his epistle to the Magnesians, he says, "You ought not to despise your Bishop for his youth, but to pay him all manner of reverence, according to the commandment of GOD THE FATHER, as I know your holy Presbyters do. Therefore as CHRIST did nothing without the FATHER, so neither do ye (whether Presbyter, Deacon, or Layman,) without the Bishop," in the spiritual concerns of the Church, no doubt. Here obedience to the Bishop is enjoined upon all orders in the Church; he must therefore be the chief, the head, the ruler, the prelate.

3. "I exhort you to do all things in the same mind of GOD; the Bishop presiding in the place of GOD" (analogical language again,) "and the Presbyters in the room of the college of the Apostles, and the Deacons, most dear to me, who are intrusted with the ministry of JESUS CHRIST." Here is a most striking disproportion between the Presbyter and Bishop, and consequently they must be officers of very different degrees or orders.

4th. In his epistle to the Trallians, he asks, "For what is the Bishop but the person who possesses the chief authority and power beyond all others? But what is the Presbytery but a sacred company who are counsellors and assessors to the Bishop?" A man must have an admirable knack at extracting what he pleases from authors, who can make this quadrate with presbyterian parity. Blondel, Salmasius, and Daille were too wise to attempt it.

Digitized by Google

5th. Ignatius in his epistle to the Smyrneans, says, "It is not lawful without the Bishop, neither to baptize, nor to celebrate the holy communion." And again, "Let that Eucharist be held good and valid which is offered by the Bishop, or by him to whom the Bishop has given his consent." Here we have the Presbyters in all their ministrations completely under the jurisdiction of the Bishop. Must he not then be in a higher grade than the Presbyters?

I have promised to show that the Presbyters of whom Ignatius speaks, were the ministers of the word and sacraments, not ruling Elders. This is necessary, because I find you asserting[m] in the most positive manner, that, 'There is not a single instance in which the pious father represents his Presbyters as, *in fact*, preaching or administering sacraments.' Let us examine this point.

1. Ignatius, as often as he mentions Presbyters, never once gives us a hint about ruling Elders. It is really incredible, that when he so repeatedly enumerates the different officers of the Church, he should not, in a single instance, put into his list that order of men. For you therefore to suppose that he meant to include them, is altogether assumption, which can never be admitted in fair reasoning. I have a right therefore to say, that all his Presbyters were ministers of the word and sacraments. But I do not rest the matter here, clear as it is.

2. As Ignatius, in order to show the great difference between the Bishop and his presbyters, considers the former as representing the LORD CHRIST, and the latter as representing the Apostles, who acted in an under grade to CHRIST, then the Presbyters he speaks of must necessarily be ministers of the word and sacraments, otherwise they could not possibly represent the Apostles. Besides, he says, that the Deacons are the ministers of the mysteries of CHRIST. But certainly there is no mystery in receiving the alms of the congregation, and distributing them among the poor. They must therefore be ministers of the word. And so he tells us in plain terms, "They are not the ministers of meat and drink, but of the Church of GOD." And he says again, that they "are intrusted with the ministry of JESUS CHRIST." This would be strange language, if they were confined to "the serving of tables." But he positively says, that they were not. It is therefore evident that they preached, and consequently *a fortiori*, that Ignatius' Presbyters were ministers of the word and sacraments.

3. In the epistle to the Philadelphians, Ignatius says, "The priests are good, but the chief Priest (CHRIST) is better." But Christian Priests always administered the sacraments. So evident it is that Ignatius' Presbyters were ministers of the word and of the mysteries of CHRIST.

4. Ignatius says, "Let that Eucharist be held good and valid

m *Continuation*, p. 183, [p. 301, 2d *ed.*]

Digitized by Google

which is done by the Bishop, or by such as he permits." The great object of the pious martyr in all his epistles is to prevent schism, to which he knew men are strongly inclined. To secure this point, he repeatedly inculcates on all orders to be subject in spiritual matters to the Bishop, and to consider nothing as legally done in the Church in opposition to the just exercise of his authority; not even to consider the sacraments as legally administered in opposition to him. Then consequently the Presbyters under him were the ministers of those sacraments.

All I find that you say to the last quotation is, that Ignatius 'might mean the Bishop of some neighbouring congregation.' And were I to say he *might not* mean so, it would be a sufficient answer. One 'might' is as good as the other. But, Sir, he could not have meant so. The martyr's epistles were written to particular Churches. What he said was intended for the Church to which he addressed himself, and not for other Churches, which he was not sure would ever see his epistles. When, therefore, he enjoins submission to the Bishop upon all orders in any particular Church, it is a complete absurdity to suppose that one of those orders, the Presbyters, was not the object of one of his most important injunctions. "Let the Eucharist be held good and valid, which is done by the Bishop, or such as he permits;" that is, according to you, which is done, not by his own Presbyters, but by the Presbyters of some other Bishop, about whom he was not saying a single syllable, and whom the epistle never once contemplates. Besides, was there any necessity for telling the Bishop of the Smyrneans, that if any other Bishop came into his diocese to administer the sacraments without his consent, it would be irregular? What a childish observation would that be! No, Sir, he was endeavouring, by his admonitions to the Smyrneans, to preserve the unity of their Church, and for that purpose advises them to adhere to the Bishop, and not to consider any ministrations valid when done even by their own Presbyters, in opposition to him. And by strictly adhering to this advice, the unity of their Church would be effectually secured. It follows then that the Presbyters of that diocese were ministers of the word and sacraments.

5. From the very state of the Church of Antioch, and the other great Churches, which have been fully proved to contain numerous congregations, and numerous Presbyters, those Presbyters must have been ministers of the word, otherwise all the congregations but one must have been destitute of a preaching ministry. This would have been a very serious defect, which the Bishop, by his personal ministrations, could not possibly have supplied. This single consideration fully proves that those great Churches must have been supplied with preaching Presbyters.

Let us now take another view of this point, and suppose that all the Presbyters of those Churches were ruling Elders. Then I say, that the Epistles of Ignatius are totally inconsistent with such a notion. Let us examine three or four passages.

Digitized by Google

Speaking to the Ephesians, he says, "that being subject to their Bishop and his presbytery, they be wholly and thoroughly sanctified." Was the presbytery composed entirely of ruling Elders? You will not venture to say so. There are several passages of this kind in which the pious martyr speaks of the presbytery, and enjoins obedience to them. But upon your ground, none of the Churches to which he writes had a presbytery, unless a number of ruling Elders could form one.

Again: "The Priests," says Ignatius, "are good:" "and so are the ministers of the word," (the Deacons.) "The Priests are good," that is, the ruling Elders are good. Were ruling Elders ever called Priests?

Once more: "It is not lawful, without the Bishop, (for the ruling Elders) either to baptize or to celebrate the holy communion;" or, according to your ingenious gloss, for a neighbouring Bishop or Presbyter to intrude himself into another's Church, and there administer the sacrament. This is a wonderful discovery!

I have one more observation to make; it is, that the presbyteries of your Church, and the presbyteries of the primitive Church, are totally different things. From every one of the Epistles of Ignatius, it is beyond all contradiction, that the respective presbyteries of the Churches to which he wrote, were formed of the Bishop's own clergy, over whom he presided. A primitive presbytery then consisted of a number of clergymen with a Bishop at their head. But this is not the form of your presbyteries. They are composed of a plurality of congregational Bishops, situated within a convenient distance, and of a plurality of lay Elders. Thus speaks your *Form of Church Government*, chap. ix. sec. 2. "A presbytery consists of all the ministers, and one ruling Elder from each congregation within a certain district." *Now*, it seems, in order to form a presbytery, the Bishops of several independent congregations, with lay Elders, must convene; but in the time of Ignatius, which was close to the times of the Apostles, a Bishop had not to go out of his own Church or diocese to form a presbytery. He, at the head of his Presbyters, formed the presbytery of the diocese; by necessary consequence, episcopacy was *diocesan;* and again, by necessary consequence, your presbytery resolves itself into *congregational* episcopacy. In this diocese, Bishop Moore forms a presbytery within his own Church; for if he had a thousand churches under him, they would make but one aggregate Church, he being the principle of unity to every individual congregation. But Bishop Miller cannot form a presbytery within his own church. He may indeed form a *Church Session*, consisting of himself and his lay Elders; just as the Rector of a church can form a *Vestry*, by calling together the wardens and vestrymen of his church. But all this is totally different from an apostolical presbytery. *That* was always formed by a number of Presbyters united under their head, the Bishop. Igna-

Digitized by Google

tius speaks this language over and over again; and what is more, the case is undeniable from the form of the Church of Jerusalem. There we find James seated among his Elders; he at their head formed the presbytery. This was a diocesan presbytery, which is the only one that Scripture and antiquity say any thing about.

The case is also plain from the state of the Church of Ephesus. There we find several congregations and several Presbyters, who are also styled Bishops, and consequently ministers of the word. Timothy at their head, and before him St. Paul, formed an apostolical presbytery; but the Presbyters alone, without a Bishop, could not have formed such a presbytery. This shows that St. Paul, after he gave up the government of the Church of Ephesus, immediately supplied his own place by sending Timothy to govern all orders of men in that Church. That the powers of government were given him, nobody denies; and whether he exercised them under the title of an Apostle, or of an Evangelist, or of a Bishop, or of a Presbyter, it does not make one tittle of difference. He was the governor of all the congregations, and all the Presbyters and Deacons in that Church; and, consequently, was the Diocesan of that district while he continued there, whether it was during his whole life or not. And it has always appeared to me one of the greatest instances of puerility and of inconsistency, for our opponents to contend so strenuously against Timothy's having been Bishop of Ephesus, with a plurality of Presbyters and Deacons and congregations under him, when several of their best writers admit that James was Bishop of Jerusalem, with many more Presbyters and many more congregations under him; and that Ignatius was Bishop of Antioch, and Polycarp of Smyrna, with subject Presbyters, and, consequently, were diocesans.

And now, Sir, I think that I have fully proved, that *your* Presbyteries and *apostolic* presbyteries are totally different things, and that episcopal presbyteries, composed of a number of Presbyters, with a Bishop at their head, are the true apostolical government of the Church of CHRIST.

So strikingly is this the case, from the Epistles of Ignatius, and from the Scripture instances which I have mentioned, that Blondel himself could not invalidate the evidence of it, but freely acknowledged that there was from the beginning a primacy of order in the Christian Church, and that the Bishop was *ex-officio* the president of the presbytery, and superior not only in dignity, but in power to his Presbyters. And further, that this fixed president was the person in whom the succession was reckoned from the very beginning.[n]

---

n Fuitque tunc (ab istis Apostolorum temporibus) *πρωτεία* illa Seniorum eique adnexa *singularis* quædam et exors (qualis præsedentium omnium quomodocunque constitutorum fuit et erit semper) *Potestas* non Presbyterio major ordo, sed Presbyterio inter *δμοταγεῖς* fungentis ætati debita propria (si loqui fas sit) natalium in CHRISTO jure prærogativa. *Pref.* p. 6.

Digitized by Google

Blondel makes a majority of power intrinsic to the notion of a *fixed President;* so that, according to him, the Church never was governed by pastors acting in *parity*. He says, his constant president had a *singular* and *peerless power*—the *chief power* in the presbytery—that he was the *prince* of the brethren, and that he neither *had nor could have any colleagues*.[o] And it is observable that he does not, as you do, make the *apocalyptic angels collective bodies*, but *single* persons, who had so far the *chief power*, that they were *peculiarly* chargeable with the enormities committed in their respective Churches.[p] This settles his opinion beyond all contradiction. He does not indeed infer from this that the Bishop was of a different order; for that would have been going the full length of the highest toned Episcopalian. This is the consequence which he labours to disprove; but as to *parity*, he utterly denies it; as well he might; for there is not a shadow of it in the Scriptures, or in all antiquity.

This plan, Blondel explicitly says, is absolutely necessary to avoid difficulties.[q] He could not, with the smallest degree of plausibility, reconcile parity with the Scriptures and the testimony of the Church. He therefore freely yields to the superiority of dignity and power to the Bishop. And thus we have Prelacy without a difference of order in the episcopate.

A Bishop thus presiding over Presbyters, Deacons, and Laity, and without whom, according to Ignatius, nothing of a spiritual nature was to be done in the Church, places him upon such elevated ground, that no art whatever can make it consistent with the notion of parity.

It follows, I think, inevitably, from this superiority of a Bishop, that all ministerial authority flowed from him. For as Dr. Chandler justly observes, "there never was in fact, nor indeed in the nature of things can there be, an episcopal Church, wherein any other than episcopal ordination was or can be allowed. In every society, the appointment and the commissions of the various degrees of officers must proceed from those that govern it. This is so evident, that there never was, I believe, an advocate for presbyterian parity but would readily grant, that whensoever and wheresoever the government of the

---

o Linus — qua collegii sacri *Senior* prima cathedra donatus, fratrumque ἐξαρχος, collegas nullos habuit aut habere potuit; (cum plures una primatus contingere nequeat) sed *successores* tantum. *Pref.* p. 35.

p *Preface*, p. 6. The whole passage is long, and, therefore, I give nothing more than a reference.

q Quod (seniorem Presbyterum, qua talem ἐν τῇ προεδρίᾳ successisse) alta mente repostum teneant velim, quotquot dum in veteres Ecclesiarum Primariarium, Romanæ, Antiochenæ, &c. tabulas incidunt in hunc unum successionis ordinem quem nunc usitatum vident; oculis defixis hærent, usque dum improvisis difficultatibus obruantur. Hæc enim una (si quid capere valeo) se ex ejusmodi salebris expediendi via commoda suppetit, si quam supra de *Seniorum* sub Apostolis apostolicisque viris et *Primatu* et *successione* hypothesin statuimus, et statuendam plenius confirmabimus, fundamenti loco sternant. *Pref.* p. 7.

Digitized by Google

Church was episcopal, the ordinations were also episcopal." This I have proved by incontrovertible evidence to have been, in fact, the case in the third century, and now it is clearly and necessarily implied in the view we have taken of the epistles of Ignatius.

As Blondel has been introduced, it may be well for me to notice here a striking misrepresentation of what I said of his opinion, about the time when episcopacy was introduced. I said that Blondel acknowledges, that it was introduced as early as 140. You say, 'Blondel does not make such a concession as Dr. B. imputes to him.'[r] This is certainly flat contradiction; one of us, therefore, must be in a gross error. Let us see at whose door it lies.

1. Blondel declares that it was Jerome's opinion, that episcopacy was introduced (such episcopacy, no doubt, as prevailed in Jerome's day) "when every where, the people being mad, after the example of the Corinthians, began to divide and separate from one another, which," says he, "cannot be sufficiently proved to have been before the year 140." And, in his preface, he labours to prove that the change of government was made at Jerusalem, about the year 135 or 136; at Alexandria, about the year 143, and at Rome about the year 140.[s]

2. Blondel frequently acknowledges that episcopacy was introduced in the second century.[t] He says expressly, that episcopacy was introduced before Tertullian wrote his book about baptism, which he dates in the year 197.[u]

2. The whole Provincial Assembly of London understand Blondel as I have stated him. In the appendix to the *Jus Divinum Ministerii Anglicani*, they ask this question—"How long was it that the Church of CHRIST was governed by the common council of Presbyters without a Bishop set over them?" To which they thus answer—"Dr. Blondel, a man of great learning and reading, undertakes, in a large discourse, to make out that before the year 140, there was not a Bishop set over Presbyters; to whose elaborate writings we refer the reader for farther satisfaction in this particular."[v] This certainly implies what I have asserted; and besides, that the whole Provincial Council were of the same opinion.

Not being content with contradicting me, you also impose a sense upon Blondel, which makes him contradict himself. You say, that the import of the passage to which I refer is, that, about the year 140, according to the best light the author had been able to attain, one of the steps towards the establishment of prelacy was taken, which consisted in choosing *standing*

---

r *Continuation*, Letter IX. p. 409. [p. 470, 2d *ed.*]

s On St. Paul's words—"I am of Paul," &c. Blondel says—Id est, postquam alii passim Corinthiorum more dementati, in partes discerpti sunt—Quod ante annum 140 evenisse idonee vix quisquam probaverit.

t *Apology*, p. 86, 92.

u *Pref.* p. 38, 39; and *Apology*, p. 3, 4.

v *Cyprianic Age*, p. 89.

Digitized by Google

moderators.[w] Now, Sir, this cannot be the sense of Blondel, (allowing him to write consistently) because he repeatedly acknowledges that there were *standing moderators*, or *fixed presidents*, with a *peerless* power, from the very beginning; and that the succession to this fixed presidency belonged to the *oldest* Presbyter, and this your own quotation in your third letter fully proves. It was not the fixed presidency that was introduced in the year 140, but it was the circumstance of the president's being *elected* instead of succeeding by *seniority*, that was then introduced, in the opinion of Blondel. Here lies your mistake, which a little more attention would, I presume, have entirely prevented, and, consequently, the not over polite observations you make upon my *supposed* misrepresentation.

I know, Sir, perfectly well, that Blondel did not mean by his *fixed presidency* to allow a difference of *order*. That would have been to write a book in *favour* of, instead of *against* episcopacy, and I am certainly not such a child as not to know the difference between *for* and *against*. I meant what the Provincial Council of London meant, viz. that about the year 140, a change from a *primacy* of order to a *difference* of order took place; and this certainly is episcopacy in the very height of the term. Let our readers now judge which of us is right.

I find, Sir, that you express a suspicion, that I have misrepresented Chamier and Salmasius also. As you do not assert it, I shall take no other notice of the hint to your readers, but refer you to the *Cyprianic Age vindicated* for full proof that those learned writers, and several others, concede the point, that episcopacy was introduced in the second century.

I also asserted, on the authority of Dr. Chandler, that Dr. Doddridge acknowledged the distinction of Bishop and Presbyter in the time of Ignatius, and that Baxter, as quoted by Hoadly, allowed that there were fixed Bishops in the time of St. John. And it is on these concessions from learned and candid Presbyterians that I introduced Chillingworth's demonstration, that it was morally impossible for so great a change to take place in so short a time.

I shall now, Sir, sum up all that I have said with respect to the testimonies from Ignatius.

1. The superiority of the Bishop is proved from the repeated injunctions on the Laity, Deacons, and Presbyters to be obedient to him in all things relating to the spiritualities of the Church.

2. It is proved from Ignatius' declaration, that even the sacraments, when celebrated out of communion with the Bishop, or in opposition to him, are neither regular nor valid; because they are administered in schism, which is totally inconsistent with the law of CHRIST's family, and with charity and brotherly love.

---

w *Continuation*, p. 409. [P. 470, 2d *ed.*]

Digitized by Google

3. The Bishop's superiority strikingly appears in all the epistles of Ignatius, from the circumstance of his being the fixed president of the Presbytery, which was always formed within his own diocese, and consisted of himself and his Presbyters, and was therefore totally different from a modern Presbytery.

4. The Bishop's superiority appears from his having the same authority *out* of the Presbytery that he had *in* it. It appears that, in fact, the Presbyters were the Bishop's counsellors; that they had no control over him, as he had over them; and that they could do nothing, as to the spiritualities of the Church, without his concurrence; he, therefore, had a negative upon all their proceedings.

Lastly; it appears from the epistles of this pious martyr, that the Bishop's superiority was not that of Pastor of a single congregation, and over lay Elders, but of a Pastor over a plurality of congregations, and over Priests; who, of consequence, preached and administered the holy sacraments.

These circumstances I detailed to a considerable extent in my first publication, but not so minutely as I have done at present; and all that I find you saying of any consequence, besides what I have already noticed, is, that 'Dr. B. supposes that Presbyterians consider the Bishop so often mentioned by Ignatius in no other light than as the *moderator* of some ecclesiastical assembly. Assuming this as our opinion, he attempts to pour ridicule upon it, by substituting the word *moderator* for *Bishop*, and endeavouring to show that the supposition is utterly inconsistent with the representation given of the duties of this officer. When a man does not *comprehend* the subject' (N. B.) 'which he attempts to ridicule, he is extremely apt to draw upon himself the laughter which he thought to turn against others. This is the unfortunate situation of Dr. B.' (Poor man! no doubt he has your pity.) 'He seizes upon a detached fragment of Presbyterian doctrine; and, imagining that he sees and understands the whole system,' (no easy matter) 'he thinks to involve that system in the absurdity which he makes to recoil upon his own.'[x]

You certainly recollect the answer you gave to the quotation from Tertullian. "The Bishop," says this writer, "is the high Priest." To this you reply, 'the high Priest may be the Moderator.' On this answer I grounded my ridicule. I showed that there is not a single trait of character in which they agreed; and that, therefore, the idea is perfectly ridiculous. Now, if *Tertullian's* high Priest, or Bishop, is a moderator, *Ignatius'* Bishop is a moderator. A moderator of what? Of a Church session? But a Church session is not a Presbytery on your own principles. The Bishop of Ignatius then, if you are right, was the moderator in an assembly of neighbouring Bishops, with a mixture of ruling Elders. But this will not do; for in the Pres-

x *Continuation*, Letter V. p. 164. [P. 320, 2d *ed.*]

Digitized by Google

bytery of Ignatius there were no ruling Elders, the Presbyters were of his own diocese, and the Bishop was not voted into the chair. Is it not then ridiculous to say, that the Bishop of Tertullian and Ignatius was the moderator of such a Presbytery as yours?

Further: Is not the moderator of your Presbytery always a Bishop? And is not a Bishop always the moderator? Are not then the elected Bishop and the moderator convertible terms? Can you not apply either term to the chairman? And does not this imply convertibility?

But it was not against the convertibility of the terms that the ridicule was pointed; for there is nothing ridiculous in that; but in the idea of Ignatius' Bishop being the moderator of such a Presbytery as yours. And if that be not ridiculous, the comparison of two totally different things, to prove that they are alike, is not ridiculous.

If this subject needs any further illustration, and the ridicule any farther point, we may be furnished with it by taking the case which you mention, viz. the number of congregations in the city of Edinburgh; you say there are twenty. Now, I ask, who is the Bishop of those congregations? Is the pastor of any particular congregation *the* Bishop over all the rest? You will not say he is. But Ignatius' Bishop, whatever number of congregations were in the city, presided over both them and their pastors. This you cannot deny; because the epistles are full of it. The city of Edinburgh, then, affords no example of a primitive diocese.

Again: Is each pastor holding a Church session, the Bishop of whom Ignatius speaks? Certainly not; for such a pastor has no preaching Presbyters under him; but if he had an assistant, he would be *co-pastor*, with equal powers, and under no obligation to be obedient to him. They would also take the moderator's chair alternately, and the senior pastor would not always be the moderator *ex-officio*. But Ignatius' Bishop was the moderator *ex-officio*, and consequently, for life. Besides, upon this plan, every other pastor would be a Bishop, and then we should have as many Bishops as pastors, in direct opposition to the Ignatian epistles, which always speak of one Bishop to a city, with his subject Presbyters and Deacons.

Let us go farther, and consider all the pastors of Edinburgh met in Presbytery. As no one of them is Bishop over the rest, there can be no *ex-officio* moderator. One of them is chosen, for how long a time I do not know, nor is it of any consequence. But the Bishop of Ignatius was the *ex-officio* moderator; and the Presbyters were to be obedient to him in spiritual things, whether *in* or *out* of the Presbytery. They were his counsellors, according to Ignatius; and not being his equals, he was not bound by their advice, though, no doubt, in most cases he would take it. He had a negative upon their decisions; for the holy martyr says, over and over again, "Let all be subject to the Bishop."

Digitized by Google

The constitution of the Church then, in Edinburgh, is at utter variance with the primitive Church in the time of Ignatius.

Had I not, then, field enough for pouring ridicule on the notion of Tertullian's high Priest and Ignatius' Bishop being the *moderator* of such a Presbytery as yours?

I cannot but flatter myself that I have now laid this matter to rest, and that we shall hear no more of that ridiculous paradox, that the epistles of Ignatius are presbyterian. And what a specimen does this afford of your hardihood? And how careful ought your readers to be not to receive your representations with confidence, when several of the ablest and most learned Presbyterians think it a most hopeless business to attempt the reconciliation of Ignatius with the doctrine of parity?

Having now said enough upon this point, I shall close my testimony of the fathers with a few observations upon what you say relating to the testimonies of St. Jerome.

It is a curious circumstance, and something which looks very like inconsistency, for a man who says there is no dependence to be placed on the fathers of the third and fourth century, to have recourse to one of them who lived about three hundred years from the apostolic age, because he thinks he sees something in the writings of *that* father favourable to his side of the question. All the fathers that we produce, although they lived from one to two hundred and fifty years earlier, are nothing when compared with Jerome. He may also say what he pleases on our side of the question, and it goes for nothing; but if he drops a single expression that may be construed in favour of parity, it is caught with avidity, and Jerome, *pro hac vice*, [for that time] is all in all. Is not this very inconsistent?

In my next I will take a short view of Jerome.

LETTER V.

Rev. Sir:

What does Jerome say?—That Bishops and Presbyters were the same under the Apostles—that before there were, by the devil's influence, parties in religion, the Churches were governed by the common council of Presbyters. This he proves from Scripture. He also says, that *afterwards* the practice was introduced of placing one of the Presbyters above the rest, as a remedy against schism. He further says, that this practice was brought in "paulatim," *by little and little*. He asserts likewise, that Bishops are above Presbyters, more by *the custom of the Church* than by the *appointment of* Christ. And finally, he asserts, that this change owed its origin to the decay of religion, and especially to the ambition of ministers. It commenced,

Digitized by Google

"when every one began to think that those whom he baptized were rather *his* than CHRIST'S." This is the substance of what you produce from Jerome; and then you say, 'I appeal to your candour, my brethren, whether any thing can be plainer or more decisive than this language. I appeal to your candour, whether the man who is capable of saying that these are obscure and doubtful passages can be safely trusted, either as a discerning man, or an impartial judge.'[a]

Now, Sir, let us calmly examine this point.

1. Jerome says, "that Bishops and Presbyters were the same under the Apostles." This I grant. But does it follow, that there was no officer *superior* to this order? As a logician, you certainly will not say it does. Well then, who was the superior officer? I answer, *an Apostle*. This, if I mistake not, I shall fully prove; and I shall do it in the words of the author of *An original Draught*, &c.

"The Scriptures," says he, "teach us, that when the Apostles had founded Churches they ordained Elders for them; entrusted those Elders to administer the word and sacraments amongst them, or (to use St. Paul's words to the Elders of Miletus) to take care to themselves and all the flock over which the HOLY GHOST (by orders and commission from the Apostle's hands to be sure) had made them *overseers*, (which, in our translation, is rendered *bishops*,) and to feed the Church of GOD, as good shepherds ought to do. The titles, doubtless, suited with the charge and ministry they were trusted with; and as they were ecclesiastical officers, and commonly not novices in years besides, they were as properly called *Presbyters of the Church* too; and, accordingly, we find both these terms indefinitely applied to them then. Yet all this while, nothing is plainer in Scripture, than that the Apostles reserved to themselves the prerogative of a ruling power over them; kept a rod of discipline in their own hands;[b] censured such as deserved it;[c] delivered unto Satan the disorderly amongst them: that they excommunicated their members;[d] and expected whole Churches to be obedient to them in all things: in short, had the sovereign care[e] of all the Churches in their own hands; moreover, all the Elders we read of,[f] who were ordained in any Church, had *the Apostle's hands laid upon them*. This great prerogative of power then (before Timothy's and Titus's special commission) the Apostles retained still; and no specious titles of Presidents, Governors, Bishops, Pastors, or the like, attributed to the Presbyters or Elders under them in the New Testament, lessened it in the least, or brought it into question: their superior character amongst them was owned by all. So that, during their lives or personal government over them, these titles might safely and properly enough

---

a *Continuation*, Letter V. p. 177, 178, [p. 328, 329, 2d *ed.*]
b 1 Cor. iv. 21. c 1 Cor. v. 3. d 1 Tim. i. 20. e 2 Cor. ii. 9. f 2 Cor. xi. 28.

Digitized by Google

be promiscuously used for any of their subordinate ministers, whereof they ordained many in particular Churches."[g]

This is a correct and scriptural account of the superior order of the Apostles; and, therefore, by necessary consequence, there were three orders in the Church during the time of the Apostles, viz. Apostles, Presbyters, sometimes called Bishops, and Deacons. Jerome knew all this perfectly well; and, therefore, he could not mean that there were but two orders in the Church; nor, indeed, does he give any hint of the kind.

What does Jerome say next? 'That before there were, by the devil's influence, parties in religion, the Churches were governed by the common council of Presbyters.' Here Jerome must mean one of three things; either that the Presbyters governed the Churches *independently* of the Apostles, or *in conjunction* with them, with equal powers, or *in subordination* to them. He could not mean either of the two first; for then he would contradict the Scriptures flatly; and we certainly ought not to lay that to his charge, unless his words were so express that there would be no possibility of avoiding it; and, in that case, he would not be worth minding. He must then mean, that the Presbyters governed their respective Churches *in subordination* to the Apostles; and that secures the apostolical pre-eminence.

Jerome says also, 'Before there were, by the instigation of the devil, parties in religion, and it was said among the people, *I am of Paul, I of Apollos, and I of Cephas*, the Churches were governed by the *common councils of Presbyters*,' under the control of the Apostles, as has been shown above. *Afterwards*, says Jerome, after this distraction at Corinth, to prevent the seeds of schism, one of the Presbyters was set over the rest. Now, as Jerome tells us, that the object of placing one of the Presbyters above the rest was to prevent schism, surely, if we allow him to have possessed common sense, it cannot be supposed that he meant to assert, that the remedy was not applied till two or three hundred years after the disease began. Long before that period the Church might have been torn to atoms by schism. And what shameful disregard to the interests of the Church would the Apostles have discovered, if, when they had a remedy in their hands, they did not apply it, but left it to after ages to apply it or not? This is such an account of the Apostles as would have indelibly marked their characters with folly.

From these observations, which to me appear highly reasonable, and perfectly conclusive, the change which Jerome speaks of, must have taken place (supposing him to be right with respect to a change at all) soon after the schism at Corinth. And then the institution of episcopacy is founded on apostolic authority.

But what shall we say to Jerome's assertion, that fixed Bishops, as a superior order of clergy, were introduced by 'little and

g SLATER'S *Original Draught*, p. 208.

Digitized by Google

little?' I say, this is perfectly consistent with the notion of the highest Episcopalian in the world. As the labours of the Apostles increased, and it became impracticable for them to superintend the numerous Churches which they planted, or as the time of their departure drew near, they gradually placed men over the Churches with the same majority of power which they themselves had exercised.

This point is also well illustrated by the author of the *Original Draught*, &c. "Before," says he, "the Apostles died, or when Providence removed them from a personal visitation of their several Churches in this or the other province,[h] we read in the earliest records of the Church, that they ordained many single persons (taken notice of without any fellow Presbyters besides) over large cities and Churches, as (according to Tertullian) St. John placed Polycarp in the Church of Smyrna, and St. Peter ordained Clemens in the Church of Rome; and Tertullian adds, that the rest of the Churches could prove their Bishops to be derived from the Apostles in the same manner; and calls those episcopal sees the *Apostles' chairs;* as Irenæus also tells us that the Apostles delivered the Church to those single Bishops, and their "locus magisterii," or *place of government*, with them; and the Scripture tells us plainly enough, that Timothy was ordained such a singular governor for Ephesus, where there were many Presbyters[i] before, and Titus for Crete; for it is plain they had a special commission to ordain Elders (1 Tim. iii. 15, 2 Tim. ii., 2 Titus i. 5) to rebuke and censure *them* as well as others, (1 Tim. v. 19,) and that with all authority (Tit. ii. 15;) to judge of doctrine and reject heretics; in a word, to set in order the things which were wanting (Tit. i. 5), the very claim of Apostolical power, in St. Paul's express words for it (1 Cor. xi. 34;) and all this so personal a charge, that the Apostle conjured Timothy (and no others with him) *before* GOD *and the* LORD JESUS CHRIST, *and the elect angels*, that he observed these things without partiality (1 Tim. v. 21;) and as a special reason for his investing him with all this fulness of power now, and for enjoining him so strictly to watch and make a full proof of this his ministry, he concludes thus, 'For I am ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand;' as if he had further said, And now this former care of mine must be yours."

"'Tis manifest, I think, from hence, that these singular Presidents of the several Churches had sundry parts of the Apostles' *reserved sovereign power* conferred upon them, never imparted to Presbyters of any denomination before, as far as Scripture and primitive antiquity can inform us. These consecrated Presidents then take possession of the Churches assigned to them, either by the Apostle's personal induction of them (as the

---

h Rom. xv. 23.

i See Bishop PEARSON'S proof of the time when Timothy was left at Ephesus.

Digitized by Google

case of many of them was) or with their full credentials to be sure. In all, or most of those great Churches, which this apostolical institution had allotted for them, they must find Presbyters ministering at that time, in such capacity as they all along had done, with entire subordination to the Apostles' supremacy over them. These ministering Presbyters, then, together with the whole Church, receiving such new commissioned Presidents amongst them, must manifestly see by those *reserved* apostolical powers of *ruling*, *ordination*, *censure*, and the like, (expressed in Timothy's and Titus' commissions to the full, and no doubt of it, signified sufficiently to every Church by the Apostles themselves, who thus placed them there,) that they had an authentic and unquestionable right of succeeding in the ordinary jurisdiction and prerogatives of their *departing Apostle* over them." "And this," says Slater, "is a plain and natural reason why the first order of ecclesiastics in the primitive Church were so familiarly called the *Apostles' successors*."[k]

Thus you see, Sir, that Jerome's 'little and little,' is the very doctrine of Episcopalians; or, in other words, that fixed Bishops, with the ordinary reserved supremacy of the Apostles, were *gradually*, as the occasions required, placed over the Churches by the Apostles themselves.

This being the fact, as appears from Scripture and antiquity, we, of course, acknowledge that Jerome is perfectly correct on this point; but when you want to make this 'little and little' begin after the apostolic age, you not only make Jerome contradict the Scriptures, but himself also; for he says this episcopal pre-eminence was '*decreed throughout the whole world.*' Now, there certainly was no authority competent to the making of such a decree after the death of the Apostles, till the establishment of Christianity in the fourth century; for you yourself will readily acknowledge, that there was no general council before that period, and surely nothing less could have produced such a change, if that could have done it. Further: As Jerome lived in that age, he could not have been at a loss to name the council; but we hear nothing of that. He must then have meant an *apostolic* decree. This is perfeetly consistent with his 'little and little.'

We have now, I think, taken a fair view of Jerome's assertions; and to show that either the view is fair, or he contradicts himself, I shall examine the passages which I quoted in my first volume.

At your glosses on those passages, I am thrown ino astonishment. That such observations should have dropped from the pen of a man of sense and learning, can be accounted for in no other way, than that you were hard pushed, and thought it better to say any thing than nothing.

After quoting what I had produced from Jerome, you observe

k *Original Draught*, p. 209, 210, 211.

Digitized by Google

—'These are all the passages which Dr. B. cites with so much exultation, and which he considers as pointedly asserting the apostolic institution of prelacy. But I will venture to pronounce, that there is not one of those passages, which can be considered by an impartial reader as furnishing the least solid ground for such a conclusion; and only one of the whole number which bears even the semblance of argument to this effect."[1]

Let us try those passages. 1. "That we may know that the apostolical traditions were taken from the Old Testament; that which Aaron, and his sons, and the Levites, were in the Temple let the Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons claim to themselves in the Church." Now what is your answer to this? It is as follows—'When he (Jerome) speaks of this parallel as an apostolic tradition, we can only infer from his language the well known fact, that in his day, high churchmen were fond of comparing the Church ministry with the Jewish priesthood; of endeavouring to show that the former succeeded to the grades, titles, and privileges, of the latter; and of pleading apostolic tradition for this doctrine.' According to this amusing account, Jerome spoke the language of high churchmen, when, if you are right, he was a Presbyterian, or something very near it. He was, by consequence, a shameless hypocrite, as every man is who thinks one thing and speaks another. And as he did not believe an original imparity in the ministry, and yet asserts that the Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons of his day had a right to claim the grades in the Christian Church, which the High Priest, Presbyters, and Levites, held in the Jewish by divine institution, then he asserted a palpable falsehood. And this was, you tell us, 'the fashionable doctrine and language of his time; it was natural for him to adopt that language, when he was not particularly called to speak of the system actually established by the Apostles.' So then, Jerome played the hypocrite, and told lies, merely to be in the fashion—it was very 'natural for him to adopt that false and deceptive language.' To the quotation from Jerome's 51th Ep. *viz.*—"With us the Bishops hold the place of the Apostles; with them the Bishop holds the third place." To this I do not perceive that you make any reply, and therefore shall take it for granted, that you were not able to give us any thing amusing on this point. In the age of Jerome, you acknowledge that there were three orders, and the Bishop was accounted the first. For what reason? Because, according to Jerome, the Bishop of his day held the place of the Apostles. Then of course the Apostles held the first rank; and we know there were under them Presbyters and Deacons. So that Jerome clearly asserts the apostolic institution of episcopacy in this quotation, as he did its divine institution in the last.

To the words, "Without the Bishop's command, neither Presbyter nor Deacon has a right to baptize," you say, 'he

1 *Continuation*, p. 180. [p. 320, 2d *ed.*]

Digitized by Google

evidently meant to assert that this was the case in the fourth century.' But, Sir, he says what Tertullian had said nearly two hundred years before, and what Ignatius had said nearly three hundred years before. So that if Jerome spoke the 'fashionable language of his day,' so did Tertullian of *his*, and Ignatius of *his:* and thus it was the fashion from the age of the Apostles. And as Ignatius had lived almost his whole life in that age, and was contemporary with the greater part of them, we may very reasonably suppose that it was the fashionable language *then* also.

Further. Your answer, instead of overthrowing what we suppose is implied in the quotation from Jerome, completely establishes it. You say, Jerome speaks of his own age, and that prelacy was established at that time. This implies, that in the fourth century, Presbyters and Deacons had no right to baptize but by authority from the Bishop. The same may be said when Ignatius wrote; and consequently, prelacy was established at that time. Then the fair inference is, that it was established by apostolic authority; for nothing less could have effected it at that early period.

To the words from Jerome, "that Bishops come in the place of the Apostles, and hold the first place among the officers of the Church," you say, 'he speaks a language in which every Presbyterian is ready to join him.' No doubt, allowing you to distort the words of Jerome. But remember that Jerome speaks of *the Bishops of his own time*, whom you acknowledge to have been *a superior order;* and then, if they came in the place of the Apostles, and held the first rank, undoubtedly the Apostles held the first rank, and surely the second and third were Priests and Deacons; and thus the argument is conclusive.

But if you had not ceded that Jerome's Bishop was a prelate, then I must have first proved that he was; for when the premise is denied, the conclusion is not admissible till the premise be established. But this trouble you have kindly saved me.

To the assertion of Jerome, that Polycarp was Bishop of all Asia, you object, that the words are taken from a work that is 'interpolated and suspicious.' But I have quoted what the learned Hammond, and Pearson, and others, have quoted before me; and what Cave marks as genuine. Jerome's calling Polycarp an ecclesiastical prince or chief is nothing to the purpose; for he applies the same term to an Apostle and to a Bishop. (*Tit.* i. *Psalm* xlv.) That Polycarp was the chief Bishop of Asia Minor, there is no proof, that I know of; but that he was Bishop of Smyrna, you yourself will acknowledge. If then, Jerome did not mean such a Bishop as existed in his day, he spoke a language that could not possibly be understood; for I take it to be universally admitted, that when a man uses terms, he uses them in the sense in which they are used at the time he writes or speaks.

These are the only objections which you make to my quota-

Digitized by Google

tions from Jerome. And now I leave it to every impartial mind, whether you do not use miserable shifts to get rid of some of the clearest testimonies of episcopacy that are to be met with in all antiquity.

But these are not the only testimonies which Jerome affords. There are others, which I will now produce.

Jerome says, "Be subject to thy Priest (or Bishop,) and receive him as the parent of thy soul." Why so? He tells us, because "we know that what Aaron and his sons were, *that* the Bishops and Presbyters are." *Ep. ad Nep.* 2.

In his Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians, ii. 6. he says, "James was the first Bishop of Jerusalem." Does he mean the first congregational, or the first diocesan Bishop?

On the 45th Psalm, he says, "CHRIST hath constituted Bishops to be the chiefs or princes of the Church in all parts of the world." This is the testimony also of the pious Ignatius.

In his first epistle to Heliodorus, *De Episcopatu non suscipiendo*—"it is not easy to stand in the place of Paul, and to hold the degree of Peter." It has been proved from Scripture, and it certainly was the sense of all antiquity, that the Apostles held the first rank, and consequently, those who hold their degree must also be of that rank.

It is needless to add any thing more. Testimonies in abundance have been produced; and those so pointed that it is impossible for any ingenuity to get rid of them.

From all these testimonies, it necessarily follows, that you have either mistaken the meaning of Jerome, or that he contradicts himself. If the *former*, you derive no aid from him; he is altogether on our side. If the *latter*, he is not worth a straw to either party.

I have now, in addition to the testimonies from the fathers in my first work, given such proofs of *diocesan* episcopacy, up to the apostolic age, as would, it appears to me, if impartially regarded, convince any man. But however this may be, it is certain, if ideas can be conveyed by words, that you are far from being correct in the following passage—'Dr. B. indeed says, and endeavours to persuade his readers, that the writers whom he quotes, declare the Bishops which existed in the days of the Apostles to have been just *such Bishops* as existed several centuries afterwards, in their own times—Bishops in the *prelatical* sense of the word. But the Doctor, with all his confidence, must pardon me for saying this is not true. He has produced no passage which makes any such declaration, or which legitimately implies it; nor is he able to produce such a passage from all the stores of antiquity, within the specified limits'[m]—that is, within the fourth century.

I really, Sir, should not be more astonished had you told me, that I have the wings of a bird, or the scales of a fish. I have

[m] *Continuation*, p. 195, [p. 340, 2d *ed.*]

Digitized by Google

produced at least twenty quotations, that go either expressly or by necessary consequence to the point you controvert. Several of these I have just quoted from Jerome, which necessarily imply as much. Does not Jerome expressly say, that the Christian Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons, had a right to claim the same degrees that existed in the Jewish Church? And was not the high Priest superior to the Priests by divine appointment? Is not then the Bishop (the Bishop of his day, remember) superior to the Presbyter, by divine appointment? Is there any possibility of avoiding this consequence? I declare, that I am totally ignorant of the meaning of words, if this be not a legitimate inference. But you are never at a loss for some kind of answer. Jerome, it seems, spoke the fashionable language of his day; that is, told a lie to be in the fashion. Very well; let it be a lie, or truth, just as you please. Then, by your own acknowledgment, he asserts the divine institution of episcopacy—the episcopacy of his day, when every one admits the Bishop to be of a superior order to the Presbyter. If it was 'natural for Jerome to talk thus,' as you say it was, then this single quotation completely destroys your assertion, that I am not 'able to produce such a passage from all the stores of antiquity;' and it also completely exhibits you in the unpleasant predicament of self-contradiction.

It would certainly be a waste of time to re-produce all the passages which I have quoted to prove that the writers of the second, third, and fourth centuries, did assert the apostolical origin of prelacy. Some of the passages are direct and positive; others necessarily imply it.

You go on in your usual strain—'Besides the direct quotations from the fathers, which prove that the primitive Bishop was the pastor of a single congregation,' (for instance, Cornelius, Bishop of Rome, who had forty-six Presbyters under him,) 'I mentioned, in my former letters, some *facts* incidentally stated by early writers, which serve remarkably to confirm the same truth. Dr. B. treats these alleged facts with great contempt, and endeavours to show that they are all either unfounded, or nothing to the purpose. I do not think it necessary to go over this part of the ground again. Of the five facts mentioned by me and assailed by Dr. B. there are only *two* of which it appears proper to take any further notice.'[n]

I am not at all surprised at your dropping three of those facts; they were too ridiculous to be named by a grave, sensible man. And had you not re-produced the other two, it would not have injured your character in the point of prudence; as I think it may be made to appear very fully.

You say, 'Dr. B. does not deny that in the council of Antioch, in the third century, there were upwards of six hundred Bishops.'[o]

---

n *Continuation*, page 196, [p. 340, 2d *ed.*]
o *Continuation*, p. 196, [p. 341, 2d *ed.*]

Digitized by Google

That I did not deny your statement, is certainly true; but why I did not, I really cannot say. Probably it was owing to inattention. But I deny it now. You name Eusebius as your authority for saying, that there were six hundred Bishops in the council of Antioch. Be so good as to turn to Eusebius, and you will find that he says no such thing. The historian's words are, μυρίοις τε ἄλλοις. This numeral signifies an indefinitely great number—*infinitus*, *extremus*, *maximus;* but never *six hundred*. The Greek word for this precise number is εξακοσιοι, as you must certainly very well know.[p]

The foundation then upon which you build your assertion, that there were *six hundred* Bishops in the council of Antioch, being a gross mistake, and as you produce no other authority but this mistranslated numeral, I need not give myself any more trouble about it.

But, Sir, were I to admit the number of Bishops you mention, it would be of no service to you. The learned Cave assures us, that the council in question was composed of Bishops from "all the Oriental provinces;"[q] and as they comprehended many hundred leagues, there was room enough for double the number of Bishops, and for each having a sufficiently large diocese.

You say further, that I do not deny 'that there were present at a *provincial* synod in Africa, in the time of Augustine, between *five and six hundred* Bishops.'

This is really a curiosity in the regions of controversy. Augustine was made a Presbyter in 391, and not long after was raised to the see of Hippo; and, in the year 410, he had a conference with the Donatists.[r] Now, Sir, at this time, you yourself acknowledge that *diocesan* episcopacy was universally the government of the Church, and yet you quote the number of Bishops in this council to prove that it was *congregational!* In the name of consistency where shall I find you? If your proof be good, then you must take back your acknowledgment; but if your acknowledgment be according to truth, then your proof is good for nothing. Now take your choice.

Another curious circumstance in this account is, that you give us no authority whatever for it, either in your first or second volume. This omission alone is a sufficient reason for rejecting your assertion as to the number. But I will not be so strict; I will, for the sake of showing our readers that you can make nothing of it, admit the fact. Now, Sir, one single observation settles the point—it is this. Every smatterer in ecclesiastical history knows that, wherever the *Catholics* had a Bishop, there the *Donatists* had one also. And not only the Donatists, but

---

p I suspect that the Doctor has been led into this gross mistranslation by casting his eye on the Latin translation of Eusebius by VALESIUS. He renders μυρίοι by *sexcenti*, not meaning by it 'six hundred,' but *an indefinite number*. Thus CICERO *ad Attic.* VII. 2. Venio ad epistolas tuas, quas ego *sexcentas* uno tempore accepi. *Ad* Attic. VI. 4. Belli periculum, militum improbitas, *sexcenta* præterea alia.

q *Historia Literaria*, Secul. Novatian. p. 100.

r CAVE'S *Hist. Lit.* p. 186.

Digitized by Google

the *Arians* too pursued the same policy. Indeed, almost all the sectaries took care to have their Bishops; for they very well knew that it would be a millstone about the neck of their schism to be without that officer. Thus, then, we see the cause of the multiplication of Bishops in Africa in the fourth and fifth centuries. Now, allowing the Donatists not to be idiots, they would take very good care to have as many Bishops at the conference as the Catholics; and then *the latter* would be reduced to between *two and three hundred.*

That this is a true account of the matter you will find by consulting Dr. Maurice's *Answer to Baxter*. The Doctor gives some of the speeches of that conference; and shows, very clearly, that both parties multiplied Bishops for the purpose of weighing each other down by numbers. But before the schism of the Donatists and the Arians, the number of dioceses does not appear to be greater than in other parts of the world.

Dr. Maurice also shows that the schism of Meletius multiplied Bishops in Egypt; the author of the sect ordaining Bishops in every region through which he passed; as the Arian controversy had before in every country where it prevailed.[s] Yet, I believe, it never entered into the head of any man before Baxter, that this is a proof of *congregational* episcopacy. At the very time many dioceses were of large extent, as appears from the *Collation of Carthage*, the *Abstract of St. Austin*, and the *Notitia* of the African Church, made about fifty years after Austin's death, and published by Sirmondus.

Your next instance of the number of Bishops banished in the Vandalic persecution admits of pretty nearly the same answer. Your authority is Victor Uticensis. He was a Bishop, and was among the number of those who were banished by Genseric and Hunneric in the year 484 or 485; and in the year 487 he wrote his history of the persecution.[t] This work I have never seen.

Now, Sir, is it not very inconsistent and disingenuous in you to persist in making such quotations, when you acknowledge that diocesan episcopacy, long before that time, was the government of the Church? It really astonishes me, that a man of your sense should expose yourself in such a glaring manner. What purpose is it to answer? Do you expect to persuade any Presbyterian who has the least reading, that in the latter end of the fifth century, *congregational* episcopacy prevailed in Africa? If there are any such among your denomination, they must unquestionably be very ignorant of this subject.

When you, Sir, will tell us what extent of country lay under the persecution—whether the whole of Africa, or but a small part of it—perhaps I may say something more; although it will be totally unnecessary, as you have freely yielded the point that episcopacy was *then diocesan.*

---

s *Vindication of the Primitive Church*, p. 544, and 518, &c.
t Cave's *Hist. Lit.* p. 296.

Digitized by Google

To my utter astonishment, you bring to view again the silly tale of Bishop Patrick's planting *congregational* episcopacy in Ireland.[u] To show how ridiculous this is, I observed, 'according to this story, we have St. Patrick, who lived in the fifth century, when all our adversaries acknowledge *diocesan* episcopacy was universal, and who was also made a Bishop of that kind by Pope Cœlestine, converting the Irish, and planting among them presbyterian parity.' You appear to me, by your answer, to feel the absurdity of this, and to be much embarrassed. You ask, 'Did I any where assert that Patrick established *presbyterian parity?* Was it not my object to prove that the *primitive* extent of a Bishop's charge was a single flock, and that that plan continued to be realized in some parts of the Christian world, even after prelacy had been firmly and generally established?' I believe nothing from the pen of a reasoner ever surpassed this. You did not mean to say that *presbyterian* parity was established in Ireland by Bishop Patrick, but that *congregational* was. Pray, what is the difference between them? Are not the Congregationalists parity men as well as the Presbyterians? They surely are. Then what is the difference between parity in the one, and parity in the other? And how would Patrick's planting *congregational* or *presbyterian* parity in Ireland, in the fifth century, prove that the *primitive* government was the same? I should rather think that the universality of diocesan episcopacy at that time, would be a much stronger proof of original *imparity*, than the solitary instance in question, of original *parity*. Notwithstanding all this inconsistence, and the broad absurdity stamped upon the face of the story, you did not hesitate to assert in your first volume, that 'this single fact, so well authenticated, is little short of demonstration that primitive episcopacy was *parochial*, and not diocesan.' *Primitive* episcopacy! An Archbishop presiding over three hundred and sixty-five presbyterian Bishops and three thousand Elders, some *preaching* and some *ruling* Elders, is primitive! And this *Metropolitical* government is little short of demonstration that *parochial* episcopacy, that is at utter variance with it, was *primitive!* And Archbishop Patrick's establishing this regimen under the direction of the *Roman* Pontif, makes nothing against the authenticity of the story! Mercy on us! to what lengths will not men go when the spirit of controversy possesses them! Common sense is set at defiance, and all the established grounds of credibility are totally disregarded.

The story of the council of Ephesus containing six thousand Bishops, it seems you are willing to give up, as you find it be a mistake; but you have got one that will answer your purpose still better. It is, 'the fact of one Metropolitan having within his district six thousand Bishops.' This is not a bad story, if it can be authenticated. How are we to come at the truth of it?

u [Dropped in the 2d *ed.*]

Digitized by Google

You have the story from Baxter, *he* had it from Binius, but from whom Binius received it, we are not told. It may be taken from some monkish legend for any thing that appears to the contrary. And although, after what you have said, I believe the story to be in Baxter, (whose book alluded to I have not seen) yet I am very far from being sure that it is to be found in Binius, if what Dr. Maurice says be correct. He points out a number of strange errors and blunders in Baxter, and says, "the main part of the councils he (Baxter) owns to be taken out of Binius, of an old incorrect edition of the year 1606; but it must be noted, that where Mr. Baxter did not understand Binius, he is pleased to give something of his own."[v]

Whenever, Sir, you exhibit this wonderful tale in an *unquestionable* shape, I shall certainly pay it due attention.[w]

Your next *fact* is, that, "in early times, it was customary for the flock of which the Bishop was to have the charge, to *meet together* for the purpose of *electing* him; and that he was always *ordained in their presence*."[x] This fact you say I deny. What fact, I pray? Is it that the Bishop was *ordained in the presence of the people*? So far from denying it, I expressly maintain it.[y] I must have been out of my senses to deny it. All ordinations are public in our Church, and, I believe, in every other. But from this you would infer, that in the third century the Bishop presided over no more than a *single* congregation. But this inference is by no means legitimate; besides, it contradicts indubitable fact. I had previously proved, by numerous, clear, and decisive testimonies, that episcopacy in the third century was diocesan. Your inference, then, either upon logical ground, or on the ground of *fact*, is utterly nugatory. The expression, 'in the presence of the people,' is very easily understood. The Bishop had his own particular church in which he officiated, commonly called the *Cathedral*, from the Bishop's chair being placed there, (*ex cathedra.*) In that church he was ordained, and to that, of course, the people resorted from every part of his diocese on such an occasion. The expression, then, 'in the presence of the people,' is strictly proper, and your inference is merely imaginary.

To show still further (for I always choose to do more than is necessary, especially since I have been charged with 'rushing' to my conclusion,) I will take the case of Cornelius, Bishop of Rome, who had forty-six Presbyters under him, and many thousands of Christians. Now, can any man in his senses believe, that when he was consecrated to that office, those many thousands got into the Bishop's Church, and formed but a *single* congregation? It is utterly impossible; and yet he was ordained *in the presence of the people.*

---

v *Vindication*, Preface. w [It is dropped in the 2d *ed.*]

x *Continuation*, p. 202. [p. 342, 2d *ed.*]

y This is another instance of the facility with which Dr. M. misrepresents me.

Digitized by Google

No, Sir, this is not what I denied; it was to the *election by the people* that I refused my assent; yet, at the same time, I observed, that the *nature* of episcopacy could never be determined by a circumstance of this kind, were it even a fact. My words are—'But whether your premise be true or not, the inference has no necessary connexion with it. A Bishop may be chosen by the people, and yet he may preside over a hundred congregations. I shall not, therefore, enter into the dispute about the mode of electing a Bishop, but refer you to the *Vindication of the Principles of the Cyprianic Age*, in which you will find a complete refutation of the notion, that in that age a Bishop was elected by the people. The author demonstrates, that the people had no other concern in the business than to bear testimony to the character of the Bishop elect, and that the election was made by the Bishops of the province, without any thing like a *polling* on the part of the people.'[z] It is now evident, that I do not consider the election by the people, if it could even be proved, any argument in favour of congregational episcopacy. There are several ways in which the people might elect, without having recourse to the notion of a *single* congregation, to which we cannot have recourse, without flying in the face of as complete evidence as was ever given to any matter of fact whatever.

This point of the controversy is well stated by Bishop Stillingfleet.

"First; The main ground of the people's interest was founded upon the Apostles' canon, that *a Bishop must be blameless and of good report:* and, therefore, the people's share and concern in elections, even in Cyprian's time, was not to give their votes, but only their testimony concerning the good or ill behaviour of the person. Secondly, That yet upon this the people *assumed* the power of elections, and thereby caused great disturbances and disorders in the Church. Thirdly, That to prevent these, many Bishops were appointed without their choice, and canons made for the better regulating of them. Fourthly, That when there were Christian magistrates, they interposed as they thought fit, notwithstanding the popular claim in a matter of so great consequence to Church and state."[a]

This, I believe, is as correct an opinion as any man, from the lights we have, can form upon the subject; and it is precisely the opinion I maintained in my second volume. I there shewed that there is not a single instance in the whole New Testament of the people's electing their Bishops; and I challenge you to give me one. I also showed that there is not the least shadow of evidence for it in the second century. This irrefragably proves, that there was no apostolic precept or example for any particular mode of electing; and, consequently, that it was left entirely to the discretion of the Church.

---

z Letter V. Vol. I. [Vol. I. p. 59.]

a *Unreasonableness of Separation*, p. 312, 316, 317.

Digitized by Google

I have now sufficiently examined your *facts;* and it appears clearly from what has been said, that you have not one inch of ground upon which you can rest your foot.

I shall, in my next, make a few observations on what you say with respect to the *Apostolical Canons*, and the few additional testimonies you give us from writers of the fourth century.

LETTER VI.

REV. SIR:

FIRST, with respect to the *Apostolical Canons*. I told you, Sir, that I did not quote the *Apostolical Canons* because I stood in need of them, but merely to show that you were incautious in pronouncing them *spurious*.

I observed that Bishop Beveridge had most ably defended those Canons; not as the work of the Apostles, for that, neither he nor any other Protestant writer pretends to maintain, at least that I am acquainted with. But he defends them as a collection of rules and practices, which prevailed in the Church in the second and third centuries. And even Blondel admits that they were compiled in the third century.

But you still think, that, notwithstanding the evidence exhibited by Beveridge, they are not to be depended upon. But ought you not to have shown that the Bishop has not proved his point before you iterated your sentence of condemnation? If we admit *suspicions* to regulate our judgment, with respect to the genuineness and authenticity of ancient writings, I fear that a great part of them will come under this sweeping kind of proscription. Be this as it may, you should, as a fair disputant, have noticed the few arguments I produced out of Beveridge in favour of their credibility. But instead of that, you shelter yourself under Bishop Taylor, who, from the quotation you give, seems to think that they have been corrupted. If Taylor really thought so, he is certainly very inconsistent, for he quotes them as freely as any man, in his *Tract on Episcopacy*, and without uttering the least expression of disapprobation. If then you can quote him as condemning them in his *Liberty of Prophesying*, I can quote him as approving them in his *Tract on Episcopacy;* and thus his testimony either way becomes perfectly nugatory.

Besides, this mode of determining the genuineness of writings, is never admitted by sound critics. Every thing of this kind must be determined by its own proper evidence, both internal and external. Suppose, Sir, I should take it into my head to deny that there ever was such a siege as that of Troy, and should offer, as the ground of my disbelief, that the very learned

Digitized by Google

Bryant has written a book to confute the vulgar notion with respect to that event; I suspect that you would laugh at me. But why, in this case, you should laugh at me, and I not at you in the other case, I cannot possibly conceive.

There is, Sir, one canon of criticism admitted by all men of learning, with respect to the *sincerity* of ancient writings. It is this. When their style, their phraseology, and the principles and practices which they record, correspond with the other writings of the age, then they are deemed genuine and authentic; and nothing less than positive proof that they are the work of a subsequent age, can destroy this internal evidence. Now the *Apostolical Canons*, at least the first fifty, agree remarkably in these respects with the other writings of the third century; and no positive external proof can be given that they were written at a later period. Nay, Beveridge has given positive proof that they were not written at a later period; and it was for that age I quoted them, without pretending to determine which of them were compiled in the second century, and which in the third. For any thing, then, that I can see to the contrary, these canons must stand against you.

I have now nothing more to do before I close the evidence from the fathers, but to notice a few testimonies produced by you from the writings of the fourth and fifth centuries.

It is an observation that will naturally present itself to the mind of an attentive reader, that you are very ready, on every occasion which you deem favourable to your cause, to quote from authors who wrote in the third and fourth centuries, after you had declared their testimonies suspicious, and therefore not to be depended upon. But if they are suspicious in *our* case, they certainly must be so in *yours*. What advantage then can you derive from quoting them, even if they speak what you think they do? What right have you to the testimony of Hilary and Jerome, if we have none to the numerous testimonies from Cyprian and others? Does *parity* make a testimony good that is in itself incompetent? Or does *imparity* vitiate what is sound and correct? The weight and force of testimony can be pretty accurately estimated, and therefore neither your judgment nor mine will be valued one tittle more than we can support it by solid proof. If the writers of the third and fourth century declare *episcopacy* to be the government of the Church when they wrote, there can be no doubt that it was so; and the person who does not admit it, does not deserve to be reasoned with: And if they say it was instituted by the Apostles, their testimony has great weight, although not quite so great as in the former case. What then can induce you to disparage the testimonies of those ages, I cannot see, unless it be that, upon the whole, they do not answer your purpose. Your great standard writers admit, that it is a lost case if they go into the third century, and that episcopacy had an origin very near the times of the Apostles. Yet your superior sagacity discovers evidence where they

Digitized by Google

could see none; and your determined adherence to what they would have deemed unreasonable, prolongs a controversy that might be settled in a few pages. This is to be lamented; but I see no remedy for it now. I must patiently follow you whithersoever you lead me.

There is another thing which ought to be noticed. You say the writings of the third and fourth centuries are suspicious. What do you mean by this? You certainly do not mean that there is any suspicion of their genuineness and authenticity. That would be too extravagant, and, consequently, would expose you to the contempt of every literary and reasonable man. What then are those writers to be suspected of? Of incompetency as to intellect? This you certainly will not maintain. Besides, does it require much intellect to know under what form of government we live? Are they to be suspected of combining from the beginning of the third century, and through all subsequent times, to make the people believe they were living under episcopacy, when they had eyes to see and ears to hear that they were not? In the name of common sense then, of what are they to be suspected? Is it that they were not men of truth? Who ever charged them with that? Are they not universally allowed to be men of distinguished virtue and piety? And did not many of them prove it by shedding their blood for their SAVIOUR? What circumstance then is it which obliges us to attach suspicion to their testimony? Will you say that the Church began to be corrupted in the third century? But that allowed, how would it help you? If the Church began to be corrupted, it must be either in doctrine or in discipline, or in both. About doctrine we are not disputing. The corruption then must relate to the discipline. But what writer ever charged the Church in the third century with relaxation of discipline? So far from it, that it is now generally thought to have been too severe; so severe that there is not a Church upon earth that would bear it. Was it that the lives of Christians were not so pure as they were in the second century? It is universally admitted, that the lives of those whose testimonies have been quoted, were distinguished for purity, and that there were myriads of the laity whose lives were equally pure. What is it then that attaches suspicion to the writers of the third century? Was it that there were some rites and ceremonies introduced into the Church in that age, which we do not perceive in the New Testament? We find that to have been the case in the second century; yet you allow the Church to have been pure at that time. The truth is, that rites and ceremonies, if they contribute to decency and order, promote, instead of lessening the purity of the Church. These are things indifferent, and are left entirely to the authority of every Church, in every age, and every country; and it is arrant fanaticism to maintain the contrary. Are your ministrations less pure because you wear a gown and band? And are ours less pure, because our ministers, besides these, wear a sur-

Digitized by Google

plice? Is our communion and yours less pure because both celebrate it in the morning, although CHRIST celebrated it in the evening? Have both Churches degenerated from primitive simplicity, because the practice of not washing one another's feet is disregarded, although the SAVIOUR set the example, and enjoined it on his Apostles? Need I go on asking such questions? Surely it is unnecessary. In what respect then was the Church corrupted in the third century? It was not in her *doctrines*. She maintained every important doctrine of Christianity in its purity. It was not in her *discipline*, for that was remarkably strict. It was not in the lives of the clergy to any greater degree than in the second century; at least we have no documents by which that can be ascertained. Was it in the lives of the laity? It is natural to suppose that, as they greatly increased in numbers, there would be more numerous deviations from purity; but at the same time there would be an increase of the virtuous and pious. Indeed, the very circumstances of the Church lead us to this conclusion. Few or none embraced Christianity at that time but from conviction; and, as it was at the peril of their lives, they must have preferred the next world to this. No circumstances can we possibly conceive more favourable to virtue and piety, than those attending the Church at that time. Persecutions, even unto death, were frequent; and power, honour, and wealth, were entirely out of the question. Consider all these things, and then say why suspicion is to be attached to the writers of the third century. These things cannot indeed be said to the same degree, with respect to the Church in the fourth century; but if *diocesan* episcopacy prevailed in the third, it certainly did in the fourth.

Now, Sir, to your testimonies from the fourth century.

1. 'Hilary, in his Commentary on 1 Tim. iii. affirms "the ordination of Bishop and Presbyter is one and the same." Could he,' you ask, 'possibly have said this, if they had been different orders, and had received a different ordination?'

It would have been better had you given the whole passage. It runs thus: "After the Bishop he places the ordination of the Deacon. Wherefore? but that the ordination of the Bishop and Presbyter is one. For they are both Priests, but the Bishop is the first, or chief Priest; for though every Bishop is a Presbyter, yet every Presbyter is not a Bishop. For he is Bishop who is first among the Presbyters. Finally, he signifies that Timothy was ordained a Presbyter, but because he had no other before him, he was a Bishop." Here Hilary means one of two things. Either, that the Bishop *of his day* had not a different ordination from the Presbyter; or that he had not, *when St. Paul wrote* his first Epistle to Timothy. If the first, then he contradicts numerous testimonies to the contrary, both in his own age and in the age of St. Cyprian. But if his meaning be, that the ordination of a Bishop and Presbyter in the time of the Apostles was the same, then he says just what we say; for a Bishop and

Digitized by Google

Presbyter being two names for the same officer, of course there was but one ordination. But Hilary does not infer from the community of names, that there was not an officer in the Church at that time *superior* to the Bishop or Presbyter, for he very well knew that the Apostles were superior, and consequently, that there were three orders in the Church; so that Hilary either way is of no service to you.

As to the rest of the passage, it is pointedly in our favour. "The Bishop," he says, "is the first or chief Priest;" the first, not merely in point of seniority, but in order and authority; such as the chief Priest was in the Jewish Church. For though he was a Priest, yet all that order were not High Priests, nor did they succeed to that office in the way of seniority; just so, says Hilary, "though every Bishop be a Presbyter, yet every Presbyter is not a Bishop."

Several of the testimonies which I quoted from Hilary in my second letter, set his sentiments in a clear point of light. He says, "In the Bishop are all orders contained, because he is the prince or chief of the Priests." Now, if there was but one clerical order in the Church, would not Hilary talk like a fool when he says, "All orders are contained in the Bishop?"

It is then evident, without any further quotations from Hilary, that he is decidedly prelatical.

Your next quotation is from Chrysostom, *XIV. Hom. on Acts* vi. You quote him as saying that, "in his time, such Deacons as the Apostles ordained were not in the Church." But what has this to do with diocesan episcopacy?

Your representation of Chrysostom is, I find by consulting the place, not correct. The whole passage runs thus: "What dignity then did they (the seven, commonly called Deacons) hold, and what ordination did they receive, is now to be learned. Was it the ordination of Deacons? This was not in the Church, but belonged to the economy of Presbyters. But as yet, there was no Bishop except the Apostles. Whence, I think, neither the name of Deacons nor Presbyters, was at that time clear and manifest; but presently, or soon after, they were ordained by that name."

After considering this passage as attentively as I possibly can, the meaning appears to me to be this—That in the opinion of Chrysostom, the *seven* were not ordained to the Deacon's office, as it was afterwards when St. Paul wrote his Epistles, and in the succeeding ages; for the office of a Deacon and of a Presbyter was not instituted at so early a period by those names, but several years afterwards. This probably is the meaning of the passage. But not choosing to depend on my own judgment, I have turned to Bishop Taylor's *Tract on Episcopacy*, and I find that he has much the same opinion of the passage that I have. "What dignity had these seven here ordained? Of Deacons? No; for this dispensation is made by Priests, not Deacons." This is the expression in which the obscurity lies. The Bishop

Digitized by Google

goes on, "Theophylact, more clearly repeating the words of St. Chrysostom, *pro more suo* [according to his custom,] adds this—'The name and dignity of these seven was no less, but even the dignity of Presbyters, only for the time they were appointed to dispense the goods of the Church for the good of the faithful people.'" Both those fathers believed that the *seven* were of the number of *the seventy*, and that they were Presbyters to whom the care of the common stock was committed for a short time. Whether this opinion is correct or not, it is very evident, that neither of them took this transaction to be an ordination to the office of a Deacon. In what respect then you can derive any advantage from it, is beyond my conception.

It is now evident that you have not given us so much as *the words* of Chrysostom; and consequently, we are not to look for his *meaning* from you. You make him say, "In his time, such Deacons as the Apostles ordained, were not in the Church." Whereas he says, that "The *ordination* of Deacons was not in the Church at that time;"—that is, when the seven were appointed—"neither the name of Deacon nor Presbyter then appears." When he is allowed to speak for himself, his opinion is very different from that you ascribe to him.

But, Sir, I will not deprive you either of the words you have given us for Chrysostom's, or of the opinion you are pleased to ascribe to him; you can have them both, and welcome. What then? Your inference does not follow. It does not follow that, because ecclesiastical authority gave additional powers to Deacons, when no other order was injured by it, that the order of Bishops could have been introduced, when the whole order of Presbyters would have thereby lost some of their most valuable rights, and, in consequence, have been reduced to a subordinate grade. This would have been a revolution of a momentous nature, of which we should find enough in ecclesiastical history.

I am really ashamed to take up so much of the time of our readers in replying to things which have not the weight of a feather; and vexed to be obliged to waste so much of my own time, when I can employ it to a much better purpose.

Your other quotations are of equal importance with the last; yet I cannot well avoid noticing them. Were I not to do it, I am confident it would be said they are too hard for me.

You quote Basil, saying, "CHRIST says, lovest thou me, Peter, more than these? Feed my sheep. And from thence he gave to all Pastors and Doctors *equal power;* whereof this is a token, that all of them, as Peter did, bind and loose."

The injunction of CHRIST is, "*Feed* my sheep." The inference is, "From thence he gave to all Pastors and Doctors equal power" to feed his sheep. And do we not say, that all Pastors have equal power to *feed* CHRIST'S *sheep*, by preaching his word and administering his sacraments? Have not Presbyters this power as well as Bishops? They surely have. In this respect they are perfectly on a level. The only difference is as

Digitized by Google

to *the origin* of the power; the Presbyter deriving it *from the Bishop;* the Bishop *from the Apostles by succession.* The power, when communicated to the Presbyter, is plenary; he has as good a right to preach and administer the sacraments as the Bishop. But this does not affect the Bishop's *rod of discipline.* And a Presbyter's having a right to preach and administer the sacraments, gives him of course the power of *binding and loosing;* that is, of repelling unworthy persons from the communion, and of receiving them again when they profess contrition and repentance. The Bishop's superiority in superintending, is not in the least affected; his business in all this, is only to see that these things *be* done; which necessarily implies that the power of the Presbyter to do them is complete. It is evident, then, that Bishops and Presbyters have equal power of preaching, and of binding and loosing.

You next quote one of the canons of the fourth council of Carthage. "Let the Bishop, when he is in the church and sitting in the presbytery, be placed in a higher seat; but when he is in the house, let him know that he is the *colleague* of the Presbyters."

My first observation is, that the most learned Presbyterian writers in this controversy acknowledge, that the distinction of orders took place a hundred years before the fourth council of Carthage. I have proved that Blondel, and the whole Provincial Council of Presbyterian Ministers which met in London in the seventeenth century, acknowledge it. They knew of this canon as well as you; but they did not draw from it your fancy, that Bishops and Presbyters were at that time equal.

2. I have proved, beyond the possibility of refutation, that *diocesan* episcopacy was universally the government of the Church at that time. So numerous, pointed, and decisive are the testimonies adduced, that you have not ventured to meddle with them. In this you have discovered prudence; and I wish I could add that you had discovered fairness, and ingenuousness in citing this canon.

3. I have proved, that in the third century the Bishops formed a distinct college, and this necessarily implies *imparity.* Blondel acknowledges this.[a] And "Chamier had so just a notion of the true nature of a *colleague*, that he not only formed the Bishop of Rome's being so frequently and ordinarily called their 'colleague' by other Bishops, into an argument (and a solid one it is) against the *Pope's supremacy*, but he also affirms, that after the introduction of episcopacy, Presbyters neither were, nor were called *colleagues* to Bishops, upon this very score, that they had not equal powers with Bishops. And, therefore, (though a Presbyterian) he suspects the wording of the thirty-fifth canon, which requires Bishops, in ordinary conversation, to treat Pres-

a Ex quo distincti cleri gradus, diversa Episcoporum et Presbyterorum collegia, &c. *Apol.* p. 162.

Digitized by Google

byters as *colleagues*, and thinks that the fathers made use of some other term. Salmasius also admits the distinction of orders in that age, and, of course, a distinction of *colleges*."[b]

4. It being then the invariable language of the third century to call Bishops, and none but Bishops, colleagues, (our ablest opponents being judges) the suspicion of Chamier seems to be well founded. For it is a rule of criticism, that when a term does not suit the language of the age in which it is used, it cannot be deemed authentic. It must therefore be supposed, that if the canon, in its present state, be *sincere*, the term 'colleague' must be interpreted in a low, qualified sense, meaning no more than fellow Presbyters, or fellow Ministers; for if we take it strictly, we shall contradict matter of fact, as several of the most learned Presbyterians are candid enough to acknowledge.

You quote another canon from the same Council, requiring the Bishop to "reside in a small house near the church in which he officiates"—to have "plain, and even coarse, household furniture"—and that "he should give himself perpetually to reading, praying, and preaching." And what do you infer from this? Is it that he is not a *diocesan*, if his house should happen to be at a distance from his Cathedral? Or that he cannot be a Bishop of that kind, if he should be "clothed in purple and fine linen, and fare sumptuously every day?" You really, Sir, must be in great want of evidence, or you would not detain your readers with such impertinent quotations.

Next, you give us two long quotations from the *Apostolical Constitutions;* and you tell me that I am bound on my own principles to admit them. Pray, Sir, what do you know of my opinion in respect to that compilation? Have I ever told you? Never. All that I said about them is in my *fifth letter*. The following are my words—"As to the *Apostolical Constitutions*, I shall not concern myself about them; because they were not published till after the time, when all acknowledge, that *diocesan* episcopacy prevailed." Now, Sir, how have you discovered my opinion of them from this?

When you, Sir, can convince any man of common sense, that the *Apostolical Constitutions*, which were compiled long after *diocesan* episcopacy was universally the government of the Church, contain any thing favourable to parity, then it will be time enough to notice the quotations you have made, and the forced, inconsistent gloss, you have given them. When you can point out, how the Bishop of Jerusalem could possibly be personally acquainted with all the poor among *the myriads* who composed his flock, or the Bishop of Rome with the numberless multitudes in that diocese in the third century; or how a Bishop's having a Deacon to attend him in his own particular church, is a proof of his having but one congregation, you shall have a particular answer. Till then, I pray you to hold me

b *Vindication of the Principles of the Cyprianic Age*, p. 251.

Digitized by Google

excused from replying to things that carry absurdity on the face of them.

Next you inform us, that the sixth general Council of Constantinople acknowledged the "Scripture Deacons to be no other than *overseers of the poor;* and that this was the opinion of the ancient fathers." Either you are incorrect in wording this canon, or Du Pin is. Instead of *overseers of the poor*, he quotes the canon as saying *Ministers of common tables.* This is precisely what Chrysostom, Theophylact, and Taylor, maintain. They maintain, that the ordination of *the seven* was not an ordination to the diaconate, but to the special purpose of managing the "community of goods," which continued but a short time; and that the institution of Deacons took place some time after. But whether this opinion be correct or not, I have observed that, the additional powers of preaching and baptizing in certain cases, given to Deacons by ecclesiastical authority, (supposing it to rest solely on that ground,) is a very different thing from wresting out of the hands of the Presbyters some of their most valuable rights, and appropriating them to a higher order of ecclesiastics. If this could have been done at all, it must have been after great struggles, and with numerous testimonies from the writers of the age in which it happened.

You give us another quotation from the Council of Aix la Chapelle, held about the year 816. They, you say, 'in the most unequivocal terms, owned the original identity of Bishops and Presbyters, and expressly declared that "the ordination of the Clergy was reserved to the High Priest only for the maintenance of his dignity."'

You should have told us, Sir, from whose *Collection of Canons* you took the above. Whether from that of Binius, or of Father Labbe & Cossortius, or from the abridgment of Father Longus a Conolano. You should also have given us the original, that I might see with my own eyes the express words of the canon. There is no such thing as answering quotations made in this loose and inaccurate manner.

But let the canon stand as you have given it. My answer is, that the identity of names proves nothing. We admit it without hesitation. We also admit, that one end for which "the ordination of the clergy was reserved to the High Priest," is, among others, "the maintenance of his dignity," or superiority over the clergy; for without this, his superiority would be no great matter. This is the principal distinction between a Bishop and a Presbyter.

I cannot find this canon in Du Pin.

You have, after this quotation, several miscellaneous observations, which are only a repetition of what you had said in your first work, and which I think were so amply answered in several of my letters, that it does not appear to me necessary to go over that ground again. Yet, to satisfy those who will not take the trouble of looking over my pages, I will notice in my next letter a few things that you have said.

Digitized by Google

LETTER VII.

REV. SIR:

1. YOU assert that several early writers of the first three centuries bear testimony, that the 'Bishops were alone considered as authorized to administer baptism and the Lord's supper.' That 'from Ignatius, Tertullian, and Cyprian, we learn that Christians, in those days, received the eucharist from no hands but those of the Bishop; and that baptism was considered as his *appropriate* work, and never to be administered by any other hands, unless in cases of necessity.'

Now, Sir, in direct opposition to this, I assert that you *have not* produced, that you *cannot* produce, a single testimony from the above named fathers, to prove that none but the Bishops administered the communion. They all assert, indeed, that Presbyters and Deacons derive their authority from Bishops to minister in holy things—that the Bishops have the supreme power of the keys, and that every thing relating to the public worship is under their control; but never that they were the *sole* ministers of the sacraments. Let our readers attend to what I have said in my first volume on this point, and they will see that I have proved your assertion to be totally groundless, and the thing itself absolutely impracticable. How could the myriads in Jerusalem receive, three times a week, or oftener, the communion from the hands of the Bishop alone? It is utterly impossible. All who professed Christianity, at that time, were communicants; and to suppose that all the men and women out of forty or fifty thousand souls received the communion from the Bishop alone, is preposterous. Besides, this would be making the Presbyters and Deacons mere cyphers, and not the Bishop's assistants, as all the ancients say they were.

You next quote the thirtieth canon of the council of Agatha. According to your account, the canon says, "It shall not be lawful for a Presbyter in the church to pronounce the benediction on the people, or to bless a penitent." Du Pin gives the canon thus: "The same order shall be observed in divine service every where, that, after the *ancients*, the Bishops or Priests shall say the collects, that the hymns shall be sung evening and morning, that at the end of matins and vespers some short chapter shall be read out of the Psalms, and that the people, being assembled for prayer at night, shall be dismissed with the Bishop's blessing."* This it seems is a proof that the Bishop was the *pastor* of a *single church*. A Bishop's blessing the people in the sixth century is a proof of *congregational* episcopacy! You must excuse

* *Eccles. Hist.* Vol. III. p. 112.

Digitized by Google

me, Sir, when I declare that this appears to me such arrant trifling as to deserve nothing but contempt.

After all this strong reasoning, and these invincible facts, you say, 'Dr. B. does not attempt to deny the *facts* here alledged—but he endeavours to evade their force by saying that these writers only mean in general to represent the Bishop as the fountain of all ecclesiastical power; and to assert that none have a right to administer the ordinances of religion excepting those who are empowered by him. And in this manner, and on the same principle, he intimates, that the Presbyters in the Episcopal Church baptize and administer the Eucharist in virtue of permission given them by the Bishop for that purpose. This is an evasion unworthy of Dr. B.'s understanding and gravity.' Well, Sir, I will try to be grave, hard as it is. It seems then the matter stands thus. The Bishop of Jerusalem administered to myriads the sacrament of the Eucharist several times every week, and baptized all the children of these myriads with his own hands; and although there were at least fifty congregations in that city, yet, by some extraordinary management, he dismissed all those congregations with his blessing, which proves him to be the *pastor* of a *single* church. Ignatius, and Cornelius, and Cyprian, did the same, so that they also were pastors of single churches. Chysostom also, although he tells us there were one hundred thousand Christians in Constantinople, yet had but *one* congregation, and administered the sacraments to all the communicants in that number, and baptized all the catechumens that were in a state of preparation, and all the children that were presented. Theodoret too, who had eight hundred Churches in his diocese, did the same, and, therefore, was a congregational Bishop. And all this is so very plain that you are astonished how 'Dr. B. could so far impose upon himself as to imagine there is any resemblance between the present episcopal plan and the above most evidently apostolical plan of Church government.'

You next sum up all that you have said. 1. 'It appears, that the titles Bishop and Presbyter were promiscuously applied to the same persons, not only in the apostolic age, but also till the close of the *second* century. This Dr. B. himself acknowledges, though he asserts, at the same time, that in the second century it was seldom applied.' This is not correct. I acknowledge this to be the case *only* while the Apostles were living, and till they delegated their superiority to fixed presidents, whom they appointed 'by little and little,' as circumstances required, to take their place in governing the Churches. I also admit, that in the second, third, and fourth centuries, nay, in every age of the Church, Bishops were sometimes called Presbyters, as the greater necessarily implies the less, and as the high Priests were generally styled Priests; but I did not admit, nor do I now admit, that, in a single instance, Presbyters were ever called Bishops. You have, therefore, greatly misrepresented me. The impor-

Digitized by Google

tance of this distinction, those who do not understand the radical points of the controversy, will not readily perceive. By setting you right in this particular, the following observation is entirely destroyed. You say, 'Now, if the interchangeable application of these terms was continued until that time, and afterwards does not occur, must we not conclude, that *about*, or immediately *after* that time, some change took place in the arrangement of ecclesiastical dignities, which led to a more restricted use of the word *Bishop*? No supposition can be more natural; and it is precisely this for which we contend.'

As this proceeds on an erroneous supposition, of course, it has not the least force. I repeat it, Bishops were sometimes called Presbyters, not only in the second, but in every subsequent age; but Presbyters were never called Bishops. This completely marks the distinction between them, and affords a conclusive argument against parity in those ages.

2. 'It appears that Dr. B. has not produced, and cannot produce, a single sentence from any writer within the first two hundred years, which gives the least hint that *ordination* was in *fact* confined to a particular order of prelates, or was considered as a rite which *ought* to be so confined.'

With respect to the first age, I flatter myself that I have sufficiently proved that *ordination* was confined to the Apostles, and to that order who took their place, such as Timothy and Titus, and that there is no instance in the Scriptures of Presbyters ordaining. And with respect to the second century, there is not a single instance on record among the orthodox of any ordination at all; so that a fanatic might with truth say, neither of us can prove that the rite of ordination was in use in the second century. But the answer is easy. It can be proved that ordination was in use in the first century, and in the third; there cannot, therefore, be any reason to doubt that it was in use in the second. If, then, it was confined by St. Paul to Timothy and Titus, it would, of course, be confined to that order of men in the second century, as we know in *fact* it was in the third, and subsequent centuries. But as you will, no doubt, deny that I have proved Timothy and Titus to have been the sole ordainers at Ephesus and Crete, I must show that the prerogatives of the Bishops in the second age necessarily imply, that none but Bishops ordained.

1. As it has been abundantly proved from Ignatius, and several other writers, that Bishops presided over a plurality of Presbyters and congregations, and that no act of the Presbyters was deemed valid, when done in opposition to the Bishops, or without their authority, it follows that they were the supreme governors of the Churches in their respective districts. Now, in every government, both civil and ecclesiastic, it is an established principle, that the *head*, or *chief*, shall be the source of authority; of course, the Bishop, to whom all orders were to be obedient, was the officer by whom all inferior officers were commissioned. This is so necessary a prerogative, that I do not think you will venture to deny it.

Digitized by Google

2. Your own standard writers acknowledge that, whenever a distinction of titles took place, it was in consequence of a distinction of offices having taken place. This, Blondel and Salmasius acknowledge. And this is one of their arguments against the genuineness and authenticity of the Ignatian Epistles. And as Blondel, in particular, admits this distinction of offices as early as the year 140, in which, as I have shown, he is followed by the whole Provincial Council of London, it follows that when the Bishop became the chief officer in the Church, he became also the fountain of ecclesiastical authority. And had those two learned men admitted the authenticity of the Ignatian Epistles, they must, on their own principles, have admitted that the Bishop was the ordaining officer. But to avoid being driven to this consequence, they rejected those epistles, well knowing, that if they admitted them, diocesan episcopacy would have been traced up to the apostolic age; and then, who could doubt of its being of apostolic origin?

3. As Ignatius says, "Without a Bishop, Presbyters, and Deacons, no Church is named;" a Bishop must have been an essential officer of the Church; and being so, he must, from his presiding over all the Presbyters and congregations within his district or diocese, have been a *superior* officer; and consequently all commissions must flow from him as the chief of the ecclesiastical community. So that diocesan episcopacy being once established, the right of ordaining belongs to the Bishop of course.

I do not think that any thing more need be said on this head. The case is so plain, so consonant to the common sense and practice of mankind, that to dispute it would argue more of a captious disposition, than of the ingenuousness of fair disputation.

In the third particular of your 'summary,' you say, 'It appears that Presbyters are represented by early writers, and particularly by Ignatius and Irenæus, as the *successors of the Apostles*, and as *presiding* over the Church.'

It is the invariable doctrine of the primitive Church, that Bishops by *single succession*, exercised a supremacy over all orders in the Church. They are not asserted to be the successors of the Apostles, because they preached and administered the sacraments; (for in that qualified sense the Presbyters were so too;) but because they governed the Church as the Apostles did. Ignatius repeatedly asserts the superior power and authority of the Bishops over Presbyters, and never says Presbyters are successors of the Apostles, but when he places the Bishops in a still higher grade, as when he calls them the vicegerents of God, makes them preside in the place of God, or of Christ; and then to preserve some proportion between them and the Presbyters, says of the latter, that they succeeded the Apostles. But in the very passages in which he thus speaks, he first takes care to raise the Bishops much above them; so that

Digitized by Google

he evidently speaks analogically. If Presbyters were in the same sense, and in the same degree *successors* to the Apostles, that the Bishops are, there would be no difference between them, and then the comparisons of Ignatius would be perfect nonsense.

Nor will the Presbyters mentioned by Irenæus be of the least service to you; for it has been abundantly proved, that they were the Bishops of the Churches, presiding over the other orders, and over numerous congregations. He particularly marks them, as holding the apostolical pre-eminence, and as succeeding *singly* to the government of particular Churches. But he gives us no account whatever of the succession of Presbyters in any one Church. We find in him a list of the *Bishops*, but not of the *Presbyters* of Rome. This succession of a single person, where there were many Presbyters, and many congregations, is a decisive proof of *diocesan* episcopacy, and consequently a decisive proof that Presbyters were not the successors of the Apostles in their supremacy over the Church.

This point needs no further observations. I will, therefore, dismiss it with St. Jerome's well known declaration: "Wherever there is a Bishop, whether at Rome or Eugubium, at Constantinople or Rhegium, at Alexandria or Tanais, he is of the same merit, of the same priesthood—*they are all the Apostles' successors.*" The Bishops, of his day, whom all Presbyterians acknowledge to have been superior to the Presbyters, succeeded to the pre-eminence of the Apostles, who, according to all writers, ancient and modern, held the first rank.

You go on: 'It appears, that in *every worshipping assembly*, in the primitive Church, the presence of a Bishop was considered as indispensable.' This is the way, Sir, that people who are not well acquainted with this controversy, are imposed upon. By a Bishop, you mean a congregational Pastor. Now, have you produced a single instance that, in Jerusalem, Rome, Carthage, Antioch, Smyrna, Alexandria, or any other city, in which Christianity was placed, there was but *one* congregation, or that where there was a plurality, the Presbyters, as co-pastors, governed the Church, without a Bishop over them? You have not produced a single instance of any such thing in the second, third, and fourth centuries; and I challenge you, with all your diligence, to produce an instance. Remember, it is not a challenge to produce an instance where there was but *one* congregation in a city, in which the gospel was but lately preached; for in the natural course of things, there would be one congregation before there were two, or more: but a challenge to produce an instance, after congregations and Presbyters were multiplied, of the Church in that city being without a Superintendent, President, or Bishop. That there was no such instance, even in the apostolic age, we prove from facts recorded in Scripture. That the government of the Church of Jerusalem was not of that kind, we prove from the sacred text. There we find numerous congregations, and

Digitized by Google

numerous Presbyters, with St. James presiding over them. And to show that we are not mistaken with respect to the character of St. James, we produce the testimonies of the ancients, who are unanimous on this point. We also produce the Church of Ephesus, where there was a plurality of Presbyters, and, consequently, a plurality of congregations, over which St. Paul held a *rod of discipline*, till he placed Timothy over that Church. And, to confirm our statement, we produce the testimony of Eusebius, and of the council of Laodicea, which reckons a succession of twenty-seven Bishops from Timothy to their time. Is not this enough for an impartial man?

You proceed—'It was the Bishop's peculiar duty to preach, and to bless the people; to administer baptism and the LORD'S supper.' None of these things were peculiar to him. Presbyters performed them all under his control, as appears from Ignatius and all the other ancients who have said any thing on the subject. He was the *chief* minister in all these matters; the Presbyters were his assistants; necessarily so; because without them he could not possibly have performed these duties to a plurality of congregations.

Next; it was his duty 'to attend to the case of every *poor person* in his parish that needed relief; to celebrate, or give his personal consent to the celebration of all marriages among the people of his charge; to visit the sick; to instruct the children of his flock statedly every week; and, in short, to perform all those duties which are now and ever have been considered as the proper work of a parish minister.'

I have shown that it was impossible for a Bishop to attend to *every poor person* within his charge, when he presided over many thousands of Christians. It was impossible, for instance, that the Bishop of Jerusalem should have known the case of *every poor person* in his district, which contained not less than forty or fifty thousand souls, but by the instrumentality of his Presbyters, who kept a *matriculation* book, in which the names of the poor were inserted. The Presbyters, even in Jerome's day, when all acknowledge diocesan episcopacy to be prevalent, were the stewards of the Bishop, of his appointing, and accountable to him as the supreme governor of the Church.[d] What they did were his acts, although done by the hands of others. *Qui facit per alterum, facit per se*,[e] is universally admitted. When diocesan episcopacy is once proved, every expression of this kind must be understood in a commodious manner.

The same must be said of the Bishop's consent to the celebration of marriages, of visiting the sick, of instructing the children, and of every necessary duty in his diocese. Where there were thousands of Christians, the intervention of inferior officers was absolutely necessary.

---

d Sciat Episcopus, cui commissa est Ecclesia, &c. *Ep.* 2. *ad Nepot.*

e [He who does any thing by the agency of another, does it himself.]

Digitized by Google

Still you go on with frivolous objections. 'It appears,' you say, 'after all that has been said to the contrary, that the *number of Bishops* found, in early times, in small districts of country, precludes the idea of their having been any other than parish ministers.'

You have produced but one instance in the first three centuries of a numerous council of Bishops, and this you have founded on a grossly mistranslated passage in Eusebius. And the councils of the fourth and fifth centuries were held after episcopacy had been established, in the opinion of all your writers, and by your own acknowledgement; so that it is ridiculous to quote such instances. Yet I have given a particular answer to each case, and have shown that they are all groundless, and without so much as the semblance of fact.

The next particular of your summary is, 'That even after a kind of prelacy arose, the Bishops were still, for the most part, only pastors of single congregations; and that there was little if any other difference between them and their Presbyters than that which now subsists between *pastors* and their *assistants* in Presbyterian Churches, and *Rectors* and their *Curates* in Episcopal Churches.'

What an astonishing instance of bold assertion! You say, a *kind of prelacy* took place in the third century. In that age, I have proved by numerous qnotations, clear, pointed, and decisive, that a Bishop presided over a plurality of Presbyters and congregations; that he was raised to the "top of the priesthood" by a *new* ordination; that he had the *supreme* power of the keys; that the Bishops formed a *college distinct* from, and *superior* to that of the Presbyters: and that this regimen was believed by all the writers of that age to be of divine institution. Have you said a syllable to these quotations? Not one. Nothing, but that you will not follow me through my tedious detail. But, Sir, it was not left to you to follow me or not; you were *bound* to do it, or to give up the point. I proved, by the most complete evidcnce that was ever given to any matter of fact; I proved it too by the best writers that ever took up the pen in favour of presbyterian parity, that your notion of a *kind of prelacy* is a mere whim. No, Sir, you did not decline the discussion because you thought my proofs were not sufficiently clear and decisive; but, I will be bold to say, because you *knew* yourself unable to invalidate them; because you *saw*, that you would plunge yourself into difficulties perplexing and insuperable. Yet you have not the manliness to retract. *Non persuadebis etiamsi persuaseris*,[f] may, on this occasion, be pertinently applied to you.

You still go on: 'It appears from Jerome, that the first approach towards prelacy was the standing *moderatorship* of one of the Presbyters; that this began in the Church of Alex-

f ["You shall not persuade me, even though you *do* persuade"—put in the mouth of a confuted disputant.]

Digitized by Google

andria very early; soon, if not immediately after the days of Mark the Evangelist; and this was the only kind of clerical imparity, that existed in that Church until the middle of the third century, when it gave place to some higher encroachments of ecclesiastical ambition.'

Jerome does not say one word about a standing *moderatorship.* He says, "From the time of Mark till the middle of the third century, the Presbyters *elected* their Bishop;" but *then*, as we learn from history, a change took place in the mode of election. You misrepresent Jerome by using the words *soon* and *immediately after*, instead of *from*, which necessarily implies, that when St. Mark died the Presbyters elected a Bishop. And this Jerome does to show the Roman Deacons, who thought themselves equal to Presbyters, that they were inferior to them; as the Presbyters alone, without the concurrence of the Deacons, elected their Bishop. This is precisely the point Jerome had in view; and it shows decisively that diocesan episcopacy is of apostolic institution, for Mark unquestionably presided over the Church of Alexandria by apostolic appointment. But your representation of the Bishop's office, considering it as nothing more than a standing presidency, has no warrant from the words of Jerome. A standing presidency indeed it was; but just such a one as all the succeeding Bishops held, down to the time of Eusebius, who does not give the least hint of any change in the office, but considers the whole succession as founded on apostolic institution. What shall we say then to your bold assertion, that 'the standing *moderatorship* was the only kind of clerical imparity that existed in that Church until the middle of the third century, when it gave place to some higher encroachments of ecclesiastical ambition?' This is nothing but your own imagination. There is not a lisp of it in Jerome. He says, or, at least, his words imply it, that the *mode of electing* a Bishop was altered in the third century; but not that the powers of the office were increased by clerical ambition. This whole matter, then, you have misrepresented most grossly.

The next particular of your summary is in relation to Deacons. 'It appears,' you say, 'from several unexceptionable testimonies, that Deacons, in the primitive Church, were not an order of clergy at all; that they were only entrusted with the *care of the poor*, and employed to assist in the administration of the LORD'S *Supper*—and that their gradually coming to be considered as a third order of the clergy, was, like the claims of the prelates, an innovation.'

It appears undeniably from the epistles of Ignatius, that Deacons were in his day, (and if in his day, in the apostolic age) an inferior order of the clergy. He says expressly, that they are not the ministers of meats and drinks, but of the Church of GOD—ministers of the mysteries of CHRIST; and he gives them a degree of presidency over the people. "Study to do all things in divine concord; your Bishop presiding in the

Digitized by Google

place of GOD, and the Presbyters in the place of the Apostolical senate, and the Deacons most dear to me, as those to whom is committed the ministry of JESUS CHRIST." And in many other places, he exhorts the people to respect them as *the ministers of* JESUS CHRIST. Tertullian also, in the same age, Cyprian and others in the third century, Jerome and others in the fourth, with several provincial and general councils, considered them in the same light. The care of the poor was but a *part* of their office; they attended at the altar, delivered the cup to the communicants, presented their offerings to the Bishop, and by his authority alone, without the concurrence of Presbyters, were ordained to read in the Church, to preach, and to baptize, when no Priest was present. All this I learn from the primitive writers.

Further, you say—'It appears from the declaration of several fathers, besides Jerome,' (Jerome is entirely out of the question) 'that *some change* in the powers and prerogatives of Bishops did *actually* take place within the first three centuries; and that several things were appropriated to Bishops in the *third* and *fourth* centuries, which those writers assert were *not appropriated* to them in the apostolic age.'

It does not appear from a *single* writer of the first three centuries, that any change took place in the powers and prerogatives of Bishops. They unanimously represent the Bishop as presiding over a plurality of Presbyters and congregations; as the fountain of ecclesiastical authority; as the supreme dispenser of the sacraments; as the principle of unity to all the clergy and laity within his district; as holding the rod of apostolical discipline; as succeeding in the Church to the Apostolical supremacy; as, in short, the vicegerent of CHRIST, to whom all were subject in spiritual matters; and this superiority of power and jurisdiction they founded on divine authority. This is the language of the writers of the first three centuries; and stronger language in favour of diocesan episcopacy we do not desire, we cannot possibly have.

Under this head you have a long note, relating to Hilary's saying, "In Egypt, even at this day, the Presbyters *ordain* (*consignant*) in the Bishop's absence." On this passage you have two remarks. 'The first is, that several eminent Episcopal divines, and, among others, Bishop Forbes, have understood Hilary as I do, to be speaking *here* of *ordination*.' Let this be exactly as you say, to what does it amount? Just this much—*they* thought so. But I might oppose to them full as eminent Episcopal divines. And what would the conclusion be? Precisely nothing. But it is of some consequence to us that your own great writers, Blondel and Salmasius, as quoted by Dr. Hammond, do not pretend to determine whether '*consignant*' is applicable to *confirmation*, to *ordination*, or to the *benediction of penitents*. Nay, Salmasius thinks, as Bishop Taylor also does, that '*consignant*' in Hilary should be interpreted by

Digitized by Google

'*consecrant*' in St. Austin, as this father says, "*In Alexandria, et per totum Egyptum, si desit Episcopus, consecrat Presbyter.*" "In Alexandria, and through all Egypt, if the Bishop be absent, a Presbyter consecrates," that is, the eucharist. This is much more probable: at any rate, you can derive no support from it.

Your second remark on this passage is, that: 'whatever religious rite it is that Hilary refers to, it is *something* which the Bishops, *in his day*, generally claimed as their prerogative; but which had *not* been *always* appropriated to them; and which, even in his time, in the Bishop's absence, the Presbyters considered themselves as empowered to perform. This is sufficient for my purpose.'

This is curious reasoning! In the Bishop's absence, the Presbyter might consecrate the Eucharist; therefore, the Bishop was not superior to the Presbyter. In this diocese, when the Bishop is absent, the oldest Presbyter present consecrates the Eucharist; therefore, a Bishop and Presbyter are considered by us as of the same order. Charity is certainly a very good thing; but I cannot carry it so far as to destroy common sense. I cannot be persuaded that you are serious when you talk at this rate.

Nay, Sir, were I even to allow that '*consignant*' means *ordination*, it would be of no manner of service to you. For as Ambrose says, (if this be the meaning of the word) "that Presbyters ordain at Alexandria in the absence of the Bishop," and mentions this as an instance in proof of his assertion, that the order of the Church was not in his day as in the time of St. Paul, it follows, that ordination by Presbyters at Alexandria, when the Bishop was absent, was a *novelty*, and contrary to apostolic practice; and therefore, a most wretched support to Presbyterian ordination. This observation, which, in my judgment, is perfectly conclusive, was made in my second letter; but you have thought proper not to bring it into view again.

The conclusion of your summary is as follows: 'It appears, from all that has been said, that the writings of the fathers, instead of speaking 'decisively,' and 'unanimously' in favour of prelacy, as some of our high-toned Episcopalian brethren assert, do not produce a single testimony, within the prescribed limits, which gives the least countenance to the prelatical claim.'

I have proved, with a profusion of evidence from the writers of the third century, that they decisively and unanimously place the Bishop at "the top of the priesthood"—that he was the supreme dispenser of the sacraments—that he had a distinct ordination when placed over the Presbyters—that he was the fountain of authority to both Presbyters and Deacons; and that the Bishops, as colleagues, formed a distinct college. These points you have not so much as attempted to disprove; and I defy you, by every effort you can make, to invalidate a single evidence I have produced. I have also shown, that several of your ablest writers acknowledge, that Bishops, as a distinct order,

Digitized by Google

were evidently established in the Church as early as the middle of the second century, and that some of them carry it up to the very verge of the apostolic age. I have also shown, from several writers of the second century, that *diocesan* episcopacy was the government of the Church, and that the Bishops held a supremacy over all orders. And, lastly, I have shown that Ignatius, who spent almost the whole of his life in the first century, makes the Bishop the supreme governor of the Church, the fountain of ecclesiastical authority, the vicegerent of CHRIST, the principle of unity, and the person to whom the SAVIOUR would, in an especial manner, look for soundness in doctrine, and strictness in discipline. And, lastly, I have shown that this holy martyr declares *this kind* of government, and not *parity*, to have been universally diffused, and to have been of apostolic and divine institution.

And now the inquiry is brought fairly and fully to a conclusion; and I think I may, with great confidence, sum up the whole, as I did in my ninth letter, in the words of Bishop Hoadly —"We have as universal, and as unanimous a testimony of all writers and historians, from the Apostles' days, as could reasonably be expected or desired. Every one who speaks of the government of the Church in any place, witnessing that episcopacy was the settled form; and every one who hath occasion to speak of the original of it, tracing it up to the Apostles' days, and fixing it upon their decree; and what is very remarkable, no one contradicting this, either of the friends or enemies of Christianity, either of the orthodox or heretical, through those ages, in which only such assertions concerning this matter of fact could well be disproved. From which testimonies I cannot but think it highly reasonable to infer, that episcopacy was of apostolical institution."

We have now, Sir, brought the inquiry, as to the fathers, to a close; and I am persuaded that no impartial mind can resist their united testimony. Let us next inquire what is the weight of this evidence in favour of diocesan episcopacy. With this I shall begin my next letter.

LETTER VIII.

REV. SIR:

WE are now to inquire, of what weight the testimony of the fathers is, in this dispute. I assert, that it is of immense weight. For if we have brought prelacy up to the apostolic age, at which time, too, one of the Apostles, St. John, was still living, can we suppose that this universal prevalence of episcopacy could have had any other source than apostolic authority? Had

Digitized by Google

the Apostles founded the Church in *parity*, could all have conspired to destroy this constitution, in a few years, while too they had St. John to keep them right? Could men of the greatest piety, many of whom had been conversant with the Apostles, concur in a scheme of this kind? Sir, it is absolutely incredible; not only incredible that they *would* have been guilty of such wickedness, but that they *could* have effected a change. The universality of parity would have been an insuperable bar to a rapid change; for rapid it must have been, to a degree exceeding all belief, if diocesan episcopacy prevailed in the time of Ignatius. That was a time of great purity, great piety, great sufferings, and great gifts and graces of the HOLY SPIRIT. These things put the idea of a change entirely out of the question, and make the supposition too preposterous to deserve a serious discussion.

But suppose the Scriptures be doubtful on this point, what will the weight of the fathers be then? I answer, absolutely decisive; their testimony removes the doubt at once; for they, and they only are the persons to whom we can appeal. Take the case of the change of the Sabbath. It is, to say the least, very doubtful, if we consult Scripture alone, whether the Apostles altered the day. What then can remove the doubt? Nothing but the testimony and practice of the primitive Church? Why then is this evidence to be admitted in the one case, and not in the other? I can assign no reason; perhaps you can.

What now would an impartial man say? Certainly, that the fathers could not be in an error with respect to the regimen under which they lived, and which they saw descending to them from their forefathers, for no more than a generation or two back. An impartial man would say—they who interpret the Scriptures in opposition to this universally attested fact, must be wrong, unless we suppose that, with regard to facts, men who live one thousand seven hundred years after the facts, are better judges than those who lived near the time in which they took place. If this be true, then the further from the fact the clearer the evidence.

But as this assertion would be a great absurdity, we ought to conclude, that the testimony of the fathers to the apostolic origin of episcopacy, and the practice of the whole Church from the age of the Apostles, is the best commentary we can possibly have on those passages of Scripture, which are in dispute between the contending parties. This is not like the testimony of a single father, or of a few fathers, to a *point of doctrine*, in which they may err. The whole Church, as to a *matter of fact* of this nature, could not err. In what other case would such testimony be rejected? In none, I will venture to assert, that could ever come under debate. It is on this testimony, and on this alone, that we rely for the canon of Scripture. In the very nature of the case we can have no other; yet by a singular talent for confounding distinct things, you have involved this point in a degree of obscurity. Let us examine what you have said.

Digitized by Google

In your third letter of the *Continuation*, you represent me as saying, that 'the Scriptures, taken alone, are *not a sufficient guide;* that we cannot *stir a step* in the controversy, to any purpose, without the aid of the fathers; and even that we cannot establish the genuineness and authenticity of the Scriptures themselves without the writings of the fathers.' You then observe—'I can only say that I consider it as a declaration unworthy of his character as a divine, and as a Christian. Has Dr. B. no evidence that the Scriptures are from GOD but what the fathers say? Then he is exceedingly to be pitied; for his hope rests upon a most precarious foundation.' In this last sentiment, Sir, I perfectly agree with you. I am really to be pitied, if you have represented the matter correctly.

First, you represent me as asserting, that we cannot determine the present controversy by Scripture alone, and that we cannot stir a step without the fathers. Now, Sir, there is not such an assertion in my whole publication.[g] On the contrary, I *have* maintained, and do *now* maintain, that the Scriptures alone *are* sufficient to prove the apostolic institution of episcopacy. But as we cannot agree in our interpretation of Scripture, I say, the best way of deciding the dispute, is, to appeal to the testimony and practice of the three ages succeeding the apostolic age. If these ages bear testimony to *parity*, then I am willing to give up the cause. But if they bear testimony to *imparity*, are you willing to do the same? You are not. Indeed, in effect you tell us so. Now, this amounts to saying, I am right, and you are wrong, and there is an end of the matter.

Who then puts this debate on the fairest footing? We take every testimony that we can find for three hundred years, in order to throw light on the origin of episcopacy. And when we have given you voluminous evidence in favour of our interpretation of Scripture, you virtually declare, We care nothing about your evidence. If men were to act in this manner with respect to any other matter of fact, *you* would condemn them as readily as *we* do. Where there is any doubt, you would say, with respect to a fact, let us avail ourselves of all the light we can possibly get to determine the point. And if this be not reasonable, it is beyond my comprehension what is. If I could possibly think as you seem to do on this point; that is, pay no regard to the history of the Church in the second, third, and subsequent ages, I should be very apt to go a step further, and say, with Lord Orford, "away with history; it is nothing but a pack of lies."

It is now evident that you have misrepresented me with respect to the fathers. When I said that we 'we could not stir a step without them,' it was not in respect to episcopacy, but to the genuineness and authenticity of the sacred Scriptures. This I *have* said, and this I *now* say, pity me who will.[h]

g The Doctor misrepresents me much too often.
h See my ninth Letter, p. 234 et seq. [Vol. 1. p. 112—116.]

Digitized by Google

This point deserves a full and fair discussion.

What is the difference between the genuineness and the authenticity of a book? I answer, in the words of the Bishop of Landaff, in his *Apology for the Bible*.—"A genuine book is that which was written by the person whose name it bears, as the author of it. An authentic book is that which relates matters of fact, as they really happened. A book may be genuine without being authentic; and a book may be authentic without being genuine. The books written by Richardson and Fielding are genuine books, though the histories of Clarissa and Tom Jones are fables." Let this distinction be strictly attended to, and then we shall proceed without any confusion of ideas.

What proofs then have we of the genuineness of the Bible? I answer, the same that we have for the genuineness of any profane author. "What proofs," asks St. Austin, "have we that the works of Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, Varro, and other profane authors, were written by those whose names they bear, unless it be that this has been an opinion generally received at all times, and by all those who have lived since those authors."[i] Is there any other way whatever? None. The nature of the case will not admit of any other. Would you give mathematical proof? It is absurd. Will you give moral demonstration? It is also absurd. Would you give the evidence of your senses? Still absurd. Would you say, it has been revealed to you from heaven? Folly and enthusiasm. In the name of common sense, then, what evidence can you give but testimony? And what testimony but that of the primitive writers? A man would be deemed out of his senses, that would advance any thing but *testimony* to prove that Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, wrote the four Gospels. And yet I am to be pitied for asserting, that we cannot prove the genuineness of the Scriptures but by the testimony of the fathers. I mean, of course, the Scriptures of the New Testament; those of the Old are proved in the same manner, by the testimony of the Jewish Church. Your pity then is misplaced; I want none of it. You are the proper object of that milky virtue.

But although we cannot prove the genuineness of the Bible but by the testimony of the Church, yet, if we did not know who were the penmen, still the sacred writings might be authentic. For, as Bishop Watson justly observes, "a history may be true, though it should not only be ascribed to a wrong author, but though the author of it should not be known; anonymous testimony does not destroy the reality of facts, whether natural or miraculous."

Now, Sir, how do you prove that the facts recorded in the New Testament are authentic? How do you prove, for instance, that CHRIST was crucified, rose the third day, and afterwards ascended into heaven? You certainly would not say, the Gos-

---

i Bishop WATSON'S *Apology*.

Digitized by Google

pels declare that these things happened as they are related; for that would do no more than open a way for the question in another form. The question then would be, How do you know that the Gospels speak truth? Would you not say, or, at least, ought you not to say, there were many eye-witnesses of those events, who, on the evidences of their own senses, communicated them to others, and they again to others, as we learn from the universal history of the Church?

Suppose, further, that you should assert that the miracles recorded in the Scriptures are a sufficient proof of their authenticity; might you not be asked, 'How do you know that those miracles were wrought?' Would not the answer be, 'Thousands saw them, and were convinced by them, and declared their reality to others on whose testimony we receive them?' But if the bare assertions of Scripture, without any collateral proof whatever, are enough to convince us that miracles were wrought, then we have nothing to do in our disputes with Deists, but to refer them to the books themselves, and on their sole authority require them to believe. But unbelievers would laugh at this, and ask us, 'Who believed those pretended miracles?' The answer is, 'Jews believed them, and, in consequence, became Christians; Gentiles believed them, and became the disciples of CHRIST.' Nay, *some* believed them, and yet did not embrace the gospel of CHRIST. So that we have friends and foes bearing testimony to those facts. And what would be the consequence if we had not those testimonies? Bad enough—we could not prove the authenticity of the sacred Scriptures.

Again: we have a book called the New Testament; how do you prove that its contents are the same as the four original Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, the Epistles, and the Revelations? Would you say, 'The book, as we have it, bears the stamp of divinity?' That would be begging the question. I want the proof that it is a divine book. 'It was written by inspired men, who proved their inspiration by their miracles.' This is undoubtedly an unanswerable proof. But *what* was written by those inspired men? Surely not our present copy; but the originals. How then does it appear that our present copy contains what the originals contained? 'It is taken from the oldest and best manuscripts that could be obtained?' So far, so good. But how do we know that those manuscripts are authentic? Not, certainly, by comparing them with the originals as they came out of the hands of the Apostles and Evangelists. How then? 'By the testimony of the Church that they are faithful copies of still older manuscripts, and so on, up to the originals.' This is undoubtedly correct; for, in the nature of things, we can have no other evidence than the testimony of all ages for the authenticity of manuscripts. And thus we have fairly and completely come to our conclusion, that without the testimony of the fathers, or, in other words, of the Church, we cannot prove the genuineness and authenticity of the sacred Scriptures.

Digitized by Google

But perhaps you will ask, 'Is it necessary for all Christians to have clear and distinct ideas of this mode of reasoning, of this progression of proof?' I answer, No; for you yourself, for one, do not appear to know any thing about it; and yet I believe you to be a Christian. 'How then are they to be satisfied?' By the authority of the learned, or of the Church, that our present Scriptures are genuine and authentic, and then by the influence of those sacred books on their hearts and lives: for they must believe the Scriptures to be authentic, and in consequence to be the word of God, before they can produce in them the *fruits of righteousness*. But 'Is not this resting the conviction of the common people, that our present Scriptures are genuine and authentic, too much upon authority?' No; no more than their confiding in authority for the fidelity of our present translation. Here they must rest altogether on authority; and the authority is as much to be depended upon in the one case as in the other. There is not the least danger of being deceived; for Christians are divided into such a multiplicity of sects, all keeping a watchful eye on one another, that it is impossible for any sect to corrupt the Scriptures without immediate detection. This is the best security the common people can possibly have for the fidelity of a translation, or for the authenticity of manuscripts; and in both cases, they must altogether depend upon authority.

Where now, Sir, is room for your pity? Where, for your affected lamentation on account of the precarious foundation on which I rest my hopes? Who would thank a man for his pity that has not discernment enough to select a proper object? The misapplication of pity, as well as of charity, may indicate a soft heart, but it is no proof of a correct mind. It proves feeling, but if affords no evidence of judgment.

We have now got to that point in this argument, that we can with propriety introduce the subject of the divinity of the Scriptures. When their genuineness and authenticity are established on the firm ground of universal and successive testimony, then the question may be asked, 'What are the proofs that those writings possess divine authority?' The proofs are numerous. The miracles prove the commission of the worker; consequently, what he delivers claims our belief; whatever he enjoins in the name of God demands our obedience. The prophecies, when fulfilled, are another proof of divine inspiration. The influence of Christianity on the heart and life is, I think, a circumstance of great weight; but I do not think that it can be deemed a direct proof. It may give confidence to the individual, but I am not certain that it can be urged in fair reasoning as a positive proof, that the principles whence purity flows are from heaven. Be this as it may, the authenticity of the Bible, on sufficient testimony, must first obtain our assent, before its contents can influence our lives. There are other considerations of some weight that might be mentioned; but it is needless; I have said enough.

Digitized by Google

These, Sir, are the strong grounds on which I rest my 'character as a divine, and as a Christian'—on which I rest the whole weight of my salvation. If you have any stronger grounds than these, it would really be an act of charity to communicate them; for I can say very truly, that I wish to rest on the firmest ground possible. But if you have not, I shall consider your pity as impertinent, and your declamation as ridiculous.

There is, however, some advantage in this kind of management. When a writer does not choose, or is not able to answer his opponent's arguments, affected pity, or the usual exclamations—Amazing! Strange! How weak! Who would suppose the writer to be in his senses! have great influence on the minds of many readers. So far you display acuteness. You find a weak part in human nature, and you apply to it; but a display of candour and forcible reasoning would be much more creditable and dignified.

I have now, I flatter myself, fully established my assertion, that we cannot prove the genuineness and authenticity of the sacred writings but by testimony; and if this kind of proof be conclusive, in respect to those writings, it must be equally so in respect to episcopacy. For both being matters of fact, both can be proved in no other way than by testimony. The testimony for episcopacy has brought us up to the apostolic age; nay, has brought us far into that age; for Ignatius, as I have more than once observed, spent nearly the whole of a long life in that age; and he asserts that the government of the Church by Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, is of divine appointment; and, consequently, that at no time did *parity* exist.

I should now proceed to examine what you have said in answer to my Scriptural proofs for imparity; but it may be well before I view this part of the controversy, to notice what you have further advanced in favour of *Ruling Elders*.

LETTER IX.

REV. SIR:

BEFORE I began to examine your proofs for *Ruling Elders* I observed, in my eighth letter, 'That were I to admit such an order, diocesan episcopacy would not at all be affected by it. As Bishops have not the *sole* power in ecclesiastical affairs; as Presbyters are their counsellors and assistants in the administration of Church discipline; so *Ruling Elders*, even supposing them to have an equal share in the government with *preaching* Presbyters, would by no means invade the negative power of Bishops.' Episcopacy then is safe, whatever may be the decision of the question.

Digitized by Google

I also observed, that almost the whole Christian world is against this order of the Church. The Roman, Greek, and Coptic Churches are against it. The Churches of England, Sweden, and Denmark are against it. The numerous sect of Independents in this country, and in Great-Britain, are against it. Nay, even Presbyterians are divided upon this subject. I quoted Bishop Sage as observing that "Chamier, Salmasius, Blondel, Ludovicus Capellus, Moyses Amiraldus, and many others, all Presbyterians, are against it." I quoted him as asserting, that "the whole tribe of the Belgic Remonstrants (keen parity men) are against it in their Confession of Faith;" and that Baxter, in his preface to his *Five Disputations of Church Government*, says expressly, that, "as far as he could understand, the greatest part, if not three for one of the English Presbyterian ministers, were as far against *Lay Elders* as any prelates of them all." He confesses himself to be one, and he cites Mr. Vines for another. Now, on this testimony from almost the whole Christian world against your favourite *Lay Elders*, you make no observations, but very prudently pass it over; although of this kind of auxiliary you generally avail yourself, when you think you can get any thing by it; but I suppose, in this case, it must be considered as a mere cypher. Well, Sir, let it be so; I will take you on your own ground precisely.

You first endeavour to show from presumptive evidence, that the office of Ruling Elder must have been instituted by the Apostles. The amount of your observation is, that the pastor cannot individually perform all the duties which are included in maintaining government and discipline in the Church, as well as ministering in the word and sacraments. And you say, 'We can hardly have a better comment on these remarks than the practice of those Churches which reject Ruling Elders. Our Episcopal brethren reject them, but they are obliged to have their *Vestrymen* and *Church-Wardens*, who perform the duties belonging to such Elders. Our Independent brethren also reject this class of Church officers; but they are forced to resort to a *Committee*, who attend to the numberless details of parochial duty, which the Ministers cannot perform. Now, is it probable, is it credible, that the Apostles, acting under the inspiration of CHRIST, the King and Head of the Church, should entirely overlook this necessity, and make no provision for it? It is not credible.'

Now, Sir, is it possible that you should not know, that there is a wide difference between your Ruling Elders, and our *Vestry*, and the Independents' *Committee?* Let us see what the office of a ruling Elder is, from your own *Form of Government.*

Sect. i. chap. viii. "The Church Session consists of the Minister or Ministers, and Elders of a particular congregation."

Sect. ii. "The Church Session is competent to the spiritual government of the congregation," &c. Is this the business of

Digitized by Google

our *Vestry*, and the Independents' *Committee?* No such thing. They have nothing to do with spiritual matters. Their business relates *solely* to *temporal* things. They cannot "admonish, rebuke, suspend, or exclude from the sacraments those who are found to deserve the censures of the Church," as your Ruling Elders can. Their business is totally different from this; and, therefore, you have misrepresented the matter altogether.

Spiritual matters belong entirely to spiritual men. Give a layman, in any degree, the power of the keys, and so far you make him a spiritual man. We find nothing of this mixture in the Scriptures. The keys were given, in the first instance, to the Apostles, and by them to Presbyters or Bishops; but not a word is there said of laymen with spiritual authority.

The necessity of having laymen to take care of the *temporalities* of a Church is obvious. There was, therefore, no reason for the Apostles' saying a word about the matter; every Church would take care of such things in their own way. It is one of those many circumstances of expediency, which common sense and common prudence would be left to regulate. But in every instance in which *spiritual power* is communicated, we find an order of men formed by the reception of it, and a name given to that order; but we do not find the name *Ruling Elder* in any part of the New Testament.

You next observe, that I acknowledge there were such officers in the Jewish Synagogue. But what of that? I proved in my twelfth letter, almost to demonstration, that the Jewish Synagogue was no Church. A Church, I observed, is a society of divine institution; but the Synagogue was of human institution, and, consequently, all its officers were so. Then your ruling Elders, if they were like the Elders of the Synagogue, are of human institution. If you will put them upon this footing, we shall have no dispute with you; yet we shall think that you do wrong in giving them any degree of spiritual power. But that is *your* affair, not *ours*. You may justify it as well as you can.

'But,' you say, 'we have better evidence.' You certainly need it. 'The New Testament makes express mention of such Elders.' It is unaccountable, if this be true, that almost the whole Christian world, from the days of the Apostles, should not be able to see those Elders, of whom *express mention* is made in the New Testament. 'There is,' you say, 'undoubtedly a reference to them in 1 Tim. v. 17.' Undoubtedly! What! when most Christians not only *doubt* of them, but positively deny that they ever had an existence in the primitive Church? But these words, 'express,' 'undoubtedly,' have their use. They make up in *positiveness* what is wanting in *proof*, which, with many readers, goes a great way.

But let us hear the text. *Let the Elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honour, especially they who labour in the word and doctrine.* On these words you say, 'Every man of plain, good sense, who had never heard of any controversy

Digitized by Google

on the subject, would conclude, on reading this passage, that when it was written, there were *two kinds* of Elders,' [that happens to be the very point to be determined] '*one* whose duty it was to *labour in the word and doctrine*, and *another* who did not thus labour, but only ruled in the Church.'

Now, Sir, I hope you will allow that there is a great deal of plain good sense in the Christian world, and yet by far the greater part is against you. I hope you will allow that Ignatius, Irenæus, Tertullian, Clemens of Alexandria, Origen, Eusebius, Chrysostom, Jerome, and many other eminent writers, who have enumerated the orders of the Church repeatedly, and yet have not a glance towards ruling Elders; I hope you will allow that these men had plain good sense. I hope you will allow that Baxter, Vines, and the greater part of the English Presbyterian divines in their day, besides numbers of foreign Presbyterians, who have distinguished themselves by their writings, and yet were professed enemies to ruling Elders, were men of plain good sense. I hope you will allow that there are many divines of plain good sense in the Church of England; and in the Latin, Greek, and other Churches, which do not allow of your lay Elders. But perhaps you think that the plain good sense of your *few*, is of a superior quality to the plain good sense of our *many*.

To confirm your interpretation of the text in question, you quote Dr. Whitaker, 'a zealous and learned episcopal divine, and Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge.' What was Whitaker zealous for? Certainly not for episcopacy; for you quote him against it. He was indeed zealous for the most rigid species of Calvinism that ever was conceived; as appears from his being the chief promoter of the *Lambeth Articles*. *Learned* he undoubtedly was; but an Episcopalian he never was, although a minister of the Church of England; for it is not every one that wears her garb that adopts her principles, either as to doctrine or government. But it is no matter what he was; we have nothing to do with *him*, but with his *reasoning*. Let us try it.

He says, as quoted by you, 'If all *who rule well*, be *worthy of double honour*, *especially they who labour in the word and doctrine*, it is plain there were some who did not so labour; for if all had been of this description, the meaning would have been absurd: but the word *especially* points out a difference. If I should say, that all who study well at the University are *worthy of double honour*, *especially they who labour in the study of theology*, I must either mean that *all* do not apply themselves to the *study of theology*, or I should speak nonsense.' Now, Sir, if I judge right, this kind of reasoning will never answer your purpose; for Whitaker leaves the point to be proved wholly untouched. The point to be proved is, that those *who ruled well*, and those *who laboured in the word and doctrine*, held *distinct* offices. St. Paul's words do not necessarily imply

Digitized by Google

it. Those who *ruled well* might, for any thing you can prove to the contrary, have been ordained to preach also; and might, in consequence, have frequently preached; but they were not *laborious* in preaching: This is the distinction marked by the word 'especially'; a distinction not of *office*, but of industry in the *same* office. Some Elders were more concerned in *ruling*, others in *preaching*; but it is miserable logic to infer from this, that those who '*ruled* well' had not also a right to *preach*; as miserable logic as it would be to infer that those who *preached* had not a right to *rule*. The word 'especially' will not warrant either conclusion. It undoubtedly implies a difference, but not in the powers conferred, but solely in their application. When Whitaker then infers a distinction of office, it is a mere begging of the question. He ought to have proved that the word 'especially' necessarily implies a distinction of office; but this he does not prove by the comparison on which he so much relies. His inference in the comparison is not logical. He observes, "If I should say, that all who study well at the University are worthy of double honour, especially those who labour in the study of theology, I might either mean that all do not apply themselves to the study of theology, or I should speak nonsense." But I conceive that there is no nonsense in this; the inference does not result from the premise; for *all* might be studying theology; but some are laborious in the study of it, while others are not; and this sufficiently marks the distinction. As in the text, all Presbyters might be preachers, but some distinguished themselves most by *ruling*; while others distinguished themselves by their painful labour in preaching. The words of the text go no further than this, nor does the case which Whitaker puts go a tittle further. Suppose I were to say, Let the students of Columbia College who study well be accounted worthy of double honour, especially those who are *laborious* in the study of the mathematics. Could you infer from these words, that *all* the students did not study the mathematics? Could you establish *two* orders of students; *one* laboriously studying the mathematics, but nothing else; the other pursuing, and well too, the usual studies of a college, except the mathematics? You certainly could not; all you can fairly and logically establish is a difference necessarily implied in the word 'especially'; but it goes no further than a difference in the degree of application, and by no means extends so far as to imply a difference in the branches of study. This can be determined in no way but by testimony. Apply to this source of information, and immediately you find it to be a *fact*, that all the students in Columbia College *do* study the mathematics, and that some labour more in this study than others, and are, therefore, in a special manner, 'worthy of double honour.' Now, this is precisely the mode that ought to be taken to determine whether Ruling Elders are implied in the text under consideration; for the words *alone* will never do it. We must first establish the *fact* that there

Digitized by Google

was such a distinction in the Eldership, and then we shall have no difficulty in determining the sense of the text—it will no longer be a matter of dispute.

Now, that there was no distinction of *lay* and *preaching* Elders I thus prove from the New Testament.

1. The word *presbytery* is used but once in St. Paul's Epistles, and no where else in the New Testament to signify an ecclesiastical council. The Apostle says to Timothy—*Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy with the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery.* Lay Elders are evidently excluded from this Presbytery; unless you will say, that the lay part of it laid on *their* hands at the same time with the pastors. But this, I am well satisfied, you will not venture to assert. Then the point is settled, unless we can find this officer in some other passage of Scripture. And it settles another point also, that your presbytery, in which there are laymen, and the presbytery of the Scripture, in which there are none, are very different things. So that you are unscriptural in the grand distinctive mark of your Church, about which you talk so much, and on which you rely so much. But this by the way. Is there then any other passage of Scripture which countenances *Lay* Elders? Not one. We read of Elders at Jerusalem; but not a hint that there was a distinction in the office. *Paul and Barnabas ordained Elders in every city*, but nothing is said of their ordaining *Lay* Elders. The Apostles sometimes called themselves Elders; but I hope they were much more than *Lay* Elders. St. Paul summoned to Miletus the Elders of Ephesus, and as they are also styled Bishops, *Lay* Elders are effectually shut out from their company. Where then shall we find this strange amphibious creature, a Lay Elder? No where, unless we can draw him out of two passages which you quote. The first is—*Having then gifts, differing according to the grace given to us; whether prophecy, let us prophesy according to the proportion of faith; or ministry, let us wait on our ministering; or he that teacheth, on teaching; or he that exhorteth, on exhortation; he that giveth, let him do it with simplicity;* HE THAT RULETH, *with diligence; he that showeth mercy, with cheerfulness.* With this passage you connect the following—GOD *hath set some in the Church, first Apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healing, helps,* GOVERNMENTS, *and diversities of tongues.* These passages, like every thing else, you quote, and say, settle the matter at once. We have *now* found the office we are in search of. 'This office, by whatever name it may be called, and however its character may be disguised by ingenuity, is, to all intents and purposes, the same with that which Presbyterians distinguish by the title of *Ruling Elders.*'

He that ruleth (let him do it) *with diligence!* Does the Apostle say, let *the layman* that ruleth, do it with diligence? Nothing like it. He is evidently speaking of different gifts and *graces*

Digitized by Google

of the HOLY GHOST; but not of different *offices*. These gifts and graces, in the Apostles' times, were common to all ranks of believers; to the people, as well as to the pastors; to the women as well as to the men. But all *offices* were not. This is too evident to be denied. Joel, speaking of the erection of CHRIST's kingdom, says—*I will pour out my* SPIRIT *on all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, and upon the servants and handmaids in those days will I pour out my* SPIRIT. Did not the four daughters of Philip prophesy? Does not St. Paul say, *Every woman praying or prophesying bare-headed, dishonoureth her head?* If then prophesying were a gift of the HOLY GHOST, common to both men and women, how can you confine it to a particular office in the Church?

Again: *teaching*, *helping*, *exhorting*, were also common to both men and women. Priscilla instructed and taught Apollos *the way of the* LORD *more perfectly*. And St. Paul calls her his *helper in* CHRIST. And the Apostle exhorts the Thessalonians to *edify one another*, to *warn them that are unruly*, to *comfort the feeble minded*, to *support the weak*. If then it be evident that all these things were common to the first Christians, both to men and women, how is it possible that any one possessing the least understanding can consider them as so many *distinct offices*, instead of so many distinct *graces* of the HOLY SPIRIT? If they were distinct offices, then we must have *seven* in the Church instead of *three*, and laymen may hold them, and even women. Is this correct?

'But what shall we say with respect to *government*? Is not that a distinct office in the Church, and does not a distinct office imply a distinct officer?' I answer, no. All Pastors, whatever their rank was, held the power of government. The Apostles were governors, Presbyters were governors, and Deacons, in an inferior degree, were governors. All pastors, whether fixed or itinerant, were styled *shepherds*, *watchmen*, *overseers*, *rulers*, and *guides*. To infer, therefore, that 'government' proves an order of Lay Elders, is as great an instance of assumption as can possibly be produced; as great as if I were to say—'prophesying, working miracles, discerning spirits, diversities of tongues, interpreting tongues, gifts of healing, exhorting, helping,' constituted so many distinct offices and officers in the Church. And as this is contrary to matter of fact, as has been fully shown, it never can be admitted, that when *ruling* and *governing* are mentioned, they imply a lay-officer to assist the pastor, the watchman, the overseer, the ruler of the flock. Nothing but direct, positive proof can obtain credit for such an officer, when there are so many powerful arguments against his having existed.

Another argument which I used in my eighth letter against your Ruling Elder is, that it is altogether inadmissible that two officers so essentially different as a *ruling* and a *preaching* Elder, should invariably be confounded under one common

Digitized by Google

name. And I further observed, that it is a most extraordinary instance of attachment to a hypothesis, that you, who make a community of names an argument in favour of parity (which, by the way, is a mere fallacy) should insist that two essentially different characters are designated by the same title. A capacity for teaching appears to be essential to an Elder. St. Paul tells Timothy and Titus, that Elders must be *apt to teach, able by sound doctrine both to exhort, and to convince the gainsayers;* and we never once in the Scriptures find the epithets *ruling* and *preaching* given to Elders by way of distinction. To these observations you have made no reply; and I must think that you *did* not reply, because you *could* not.

Another argument which I advanced against Lay Elders is, that by the rule of Scripture *all* Elders are entitled to a maintenance. Then Lay Elders must be entitled to it. I admit that this is not by any means a forcible argument; nor did I consider it as such. I mentioned it merely to show the improbability that the Church was burdened with the appointment of officers, who were not at all necessary. The *preaching* Presbyters had a right, from their commission, to govern, as all acknowledge; and their government was entirely confined to spiritual matters, or, in other words, to the power of the keys. But had you proved the fact that Lay Elders were of apostolic institution, this kind of argument could have no weight, as probabilities in reasoning can never be admitted against the evidence of fact. It was only on the supposition that you had *not* proved the fact, that I considered this circumstance as affording a degree of probability, that Lay Elders would not have been appointed.

The sum then of what has been said is this—The text we have been considering does not afford the least ground for support of Lay Elders. A distinction among the Elders spoken of there was; but it was a distinction of *personal exertion*, not of *office*. None of the Elders we read of in the New Testament have the epithet *lay* applied to them; and, in several instances quoted, they are expressly marked as ministers of *the word*. The Presbytery mentioned by St. Paul necessarily excludes them, unless we allow them power to ordain. And, lastly, as the rod of discipline put into the hands of *Pastors* is entirely of a *spiritual* nature, and founded altogether on the administration of the sacraments, Lay Elders can have no share whatever in the *spiritual* government of the Church, and, consequently, are a mere human invention.

But if we cannot find this order of men in the New Testament, perhaps we may in the writings of some of the fathers. Now, allowing this to be the case, with what consistency can *you* appeal to them—*you*, who will not allow the unanimous testimony of the fathers in favour of episcopacy to be conclusive, if we cannot find it in the Scriptures? Surely, this is most extravagantly unreasonable. If there is but a shadow in the fathers in *your* favour, you eagerly catch at it; but if *we* produce numer-

Digitized by Google

ous and decisive proofs from them in *our* favour, they are not worthy of regard. I should think it quite enough for you to contradict the universally received principles of evidence; but to be inconsistent too, is rather too much.

Another striking instance of your inconsistency, is your beginning your testimony for Lay Elders in the fourth century, after you had made a terrible outcry against me for pursuing the same method. In *me*, it indicated 'a distressing consciousness of the weakness of my cause;' in *you*, it is, no doubt, a proof of the goodness of your cause. In *me*, it was 'unnatural;' in *you*, it is perfectly natural. *My* testimonies are depreciated, because the age was corrupt; *yours* are not in the least affected by that circumstance. You seem to have completely adopted the principle of the lawyer in the fable—"If it was *your* ox that gored *my* cow, that is a very different matter."

But, Sir, as I wish to possess that charity which *beareth all things*, I will, in my next letter, patiently examine your testimonies, and give them all the consequence they deserve.

LETTER X.

REV. SIR:

YOU first quote the *Gesta Purgationis Cæciliani et Felicis*, in which are these words—"the Presbyters, the Deacons, and Elders;" and again, "call the fellow-clergymen, and Elders of the people, *ecclesiastical men*, and let them inquire what are these dissentions." Further: a letter read in that assembly was addressed "to the Clergyman and the Elders," and another "to the Clergymen and the Elders."

Now, Sir, the first observation I have to make is, that you are exceedingly inadvertent with respect to testimonies. After these quotations you produce Hilary saying, that these Elders were out of use in his time, which was the fourth century, the very age in which Optatus lived. If they were out of use at that time, what are the quotations from the *Gesta* good for? If they were not out of use, what is the quotation from Hilary good for? One of them certainly is good for nothing, as they are flat contradictions. To which then will you adhere? For surely you will not insist upon my answering both sides of a contradiction. Till you pronounce your election, I am, by the laws of fair disputation, under no obligation to answer either; and even then it would be quite sufficient to set one quotation against the other, and leave our readers to strike the balance. But, Sir, I can easily excuse you—*In longo opere, fas est obrepere somnum.* [In a long work, we must allow a man sometimes to nod.]

Notwithstanding I am under no obligation to take any further

Digitized by Google

notice of this contradiction, yet I will fully and fairly examine all that you have said.

On the two passages quoted from the *Gesta*, you ask, 'What can this language mean? Here is a class of men expressly called *ecclesiastical men*, or *Church officers*, who are styled *Elders*, and yet distinguished from the *clergy*, with whom, at the same time, they meet and officially transact business. If these be not the *Elders* of whom we are in search, we may give up all the rules of evidence.'

The Elders then in these passages being called *ecclesiastical men*, and distinguished from the clergy, must be your Lay Elders, who are concerned in the discipline of the Church.

Now, Sir, I wonder you did not recollect that St. Cyprian calls *singers* and *readers* ecclesiastical men. Are they for that reason to be deemed an order of apostolical institution, and concerned in the discipline of the Church? Nay, the holy martyr calls *readers*, 'clergymen.' Are readers of apostolic institution? Why then are your *ecclesiastical Elders* to be founded on apostolic sanction? And if because they are distinguished from the Clergy, they are Ruling Elders, with whom are they to be ranked? Not among the Clergy, for they are distinguished from them; not among the laity, for they are distinguished from them also. With whom then are we to rank them? for they belong to neither clergy nor laity. I believe, among the creatures of imagination.

You produce two passages of similar import from Augustine, Bishop of Hippo. He speaks of "Peregrine the Presbyter, and the Elders of the Mustacan district." And again; he addresses one of his epistles to his Church at Hippo, "To the beloved brethren, the Clergymen, the Elders, and all the people of the Church of Hippo." And then you observe, 'There were some Elders in the days of Augustine who were not clergymen, *i. e.* Lay Elders.' Then, I say, there were in the days of Augustine, *Elders*, who were not of the people. I ask again, if they were neither Clergymen nor laymen, what were they?

And here I would put you in mind once more of my observation with respect to this order of men, supposing them to have had an existence in the primitive Church—that diocesan episcopacy is not at all affected by it. Here we have proof from fact that the observation is correct. You will have it that they were in the Church in the fourth century, and yet you acknowledge that diocesan episcopacy prevailed in that age. Were you then to establish your point, you do not in the least injure episcopacy. Let our readers remember this.

Your next quotation is from Cyprian's twenty-ninth epistle, directed—"to his brethren, the Presbyters, and Deacons." In this epistle he thus speaks: "You are to take notice that I have ordained Saturus a *reader*, and the confessor Optatus a *sub-deacon*; whom we had all before agreed to place in the rank and degree next to that of the clergy. Upon Easter day we

Digitized by Google

made one or two trials of Saturus in reading, when we were approving our readers before the *teaching Presbyters*, and then appointed Optatus, from among the *readers*, to be a teacher of the hearers." On this passage you quote Marshal, the translator of Cyprian, thus speaking—"It is hence, I think, apparent, that all Presbyters were not *teachers*, but *assisted the Bishop in other parts* of his office." It would have given a fairer view of Marshal's opinion, had you given the whole note. I will supply the defect. Of *teaching* Presbyters he says, "these were the stated judges of the fitness of such as were to be the *teachers* (in a lower form) of the hearers." According to Marshal, some of the Presbyters were appointed to instruct, not by *preaching*, but (probably) by catechizing the hearers, who, he expressly says in the next note, were catechumens. And "hence it is, I think, apparent, that all Presbyters were not *teachers*, but assisted the Bishop in other parts of his office;" that is, *all* the Presbyters were not appointed to teach in this inferior manner; but were employed in assisting the Bishop by preaching, administering the sacraments, visiting the sick, and exercising discipline: "So that the *ministry* then was not solely nor singly a *preaching ministry*;" but Presbyters were appointed to teach the people in a more easy and familiar manner than public preaching will admit. "Hermas, in Vision 3d, hath the mention of these *teachers*; and St. Paul alludes to them in 1 Tim. v. 17. It is very probable that the original of this distinction was founded in *extraordinary gifts*, which, in our author's time, were not totally discontinued; nor were, therefore, the offices founded on them. But we read of no distinction between *teaching* and other Presbyters in later times, when it is agreed that miraculous gifts were quite ceased. The *thing*, however, continued all along in some form or other, and there were always in the Church some *non-teaching*, as well as *teaching* Presbyters, when the *nominal* distinction was utterly abolished."

Thus it is evident, that, had you given the whole of Marshal's note, he would appear to be directly opposed to your *lay* and preaching Presbyters. The distinction is that of *teaching*, not of *ruling* Elders; and that only till extraordinary gifts had ceased. Whether he is right or not is another matter; but it is certain that neither he nor Cyprian give the least hint of *Ruling* Elders.

On this passage from Cyprian you also quote Bishop Fell. But he seems to be of the same opinion with Marshal. He says, "Inter Presbyteros, Rectores & Doctores, olim distinxisse videtur Divus Paulus, *Ep.* i. *ad Tim.* iv. 17." But he does not say that this distinction was that of Ruling Elders, without the power of preaching and administering the sacraments, and of Elders with that power. This is evident from his observing in the *same note*, that Optatus, the *reader*, had been lately devoted or set apart to the instruction of the catechumens. This is the kind of *teaching* Elders spoken of by Fell and Marshal as distinguished from the Priests.

Digitized by Google

I find, Sir, that you have not brought to view again the case of Numidicus, from Cyprian, nor your testimony from Origen. At this I do not wonder; for you certainly were completely defeated as to those testimonies.

You next take us back from the third to the fourth century, and once more produce the testimony of Hilary. It begins thus: "For indeed, among all nations, old age is honourable. Thence it is (from this respect to old age) that the Synagogue, and afterwards the Church, had *Elders*; without whose counsel nothing was done in the Church; which, by what negligence *it grew into disuse* I know not, unless, perhaps, by the *sloth*, or rather by the *pride* of the *teachers*, while they alone wished to appear something."

Now, Sir, whatever may be the meaning of this passage, you, as I have already observed, are not entitled to any benefit from it, unless you will give up the quotations from the *Gesta* and St. Augustine; which, if your interpretation be correct, prove Hilary to have spoken an untruth; unless a thing can be *in* use and *out* of use at the same time. Yet, as your testimonies are so very few, and but shadows at the best, you shall have them all and welcome.

On this passage from Hilary, you observe, "It is scarcely credible to what a miserable expedient Dr. B. resorts to set aside the force of this testimony. He insists upon it, that the pious father only meant to say, that 'in former times the *elderly men* of the Church used to be consulted, which custom is now laid aside.'" And again—'He says nothing more than that it was formerly customary to consult the *aged*; no doubt in difficult situations of the Church, which frequently occurred in the first three centuries, while persecution lasted.' Upon this you observe, 'it is difficult to answer suggestions of this kind in grave or respectful language. Can any man in his senses believe that Hilary only designed to inform his readers, that in the Jewish Synagogues there were persons who had attained a considerable *age*; that this is also the case in the Christian Church, and that in difficult cases, these aged persons were consulted? This would have been a sage remark indeed.' Were you, Sir, an ingenuous opponent, you would not suppose that I meant to tell my readers, that there were aged men in the Church, which every child knows to be the fact; but that aged, grave, and sensible laymen were much consulted in the primitive times of the Church, when she was so often thrown into critical situations, and reduced to distressing straits. But in Hilary's day the *aged* were not consulted, but the clergy conducted every thing at their own pleasure. Now, that there is not much *sageness* in the remark is true; but there may be *truth* in it notwithstanding. Hilary does not say, that these seniors were Ruling Elders; he does not say, that they were a component part of every Presbytery; he does not say, that they with the pastors have the "power of examining and licensing candidates for the Gospel

Digitized by Google

ministry—of ordaining, settling, removing, or judging ministers—of resolving questions of doctrine or discipline—of condemning erroneous opinions;" in short, "of ordering whatever pertains to the spiritual concerns of the Churches under their care."[k] Not a hint is given of any one of these particulars. He says no more than that seniors or elderly men were consulted; but that the custom was grown into disuse in his time. And yet out of this you endeavour to draw Ruling Elders, who had concern, and no small share of it, in spiritual matters. And you speak with so much confidence, that one would really suppose the fact was as clear as the sun. Elderly men were consulted; therefore there were Ruling Elders, who shared in the spiritual government of the Church. A very logical inference to be sure!

'But what decides the question (as you say) is, that in the fourth century this plan of having Elders to assist by their counsel in the government of the Church, had chiefly *grown into disuse*.' And from this circumstance you seem to think that Hilary's Elders must be of the *ruling* kind, otherwise the Church must have become so corrupt as to thrust *all aged persons* out of its communion; 'or, if the more venerable and aged were suffered to remain, were they never more consulted in cases of difficulty and danger?' This is most extraordinary reasoning! Either the *aged* must have been *consulted*, or they must have been *excluded* from the Church. But what necessity is there for consulting them? Certainly, in ordinary cases, there is none; the Bishops and Clergy are able enough to do without it; but in times of great difficulty and danger, as in the first three centuries, when the Church was under terrible persecution from the Heathen, all its collected wisdom would be deemed necessary. The aged part of every congregation would then be consulted. But when Christianity became established, and the Church enjoyed the favour of the government, this practice ceased, although there was still enough of difficulty arising from the persecutions of the Arians and other heretics to have kept it in the Church. But the Clergy, indulging sloth or pride, dropped the practice. That any thing more can be made out of this passage, is utterly beyond my comprehension.

But supposing, Sir, there *was* a bench of Elders chosen by the people to represent them, as your *Form of Government* speaks, does it appear from Hilary that they had any thing more to do than to give their advice to the Bishops and Clergy? There is not the least appearance of any thing further; not the least appearance of their having any concern in the *spiritual* government of the Church. Your conclusion then is mere arbitrary assumption.

It appears to me very extraordinary, that if there was an order of *Lay* Elders in the Church, not one of the great commentators or historians of antiquity should give us any hint of it. St.

[k] *Presbyterian Form of Government.*

Digitized by Google

Jerome, whose learning you admit, in his commentary on the texts quoted, does not give us the least hint of it. He was as quick sighted as you are, and yet he could not see any Lay Elders in Scripture; nor in the more early ages of antiquity. Nor after him could the historians Socrates and Theodoret. The learned Chrysostom also gives us no hint of the kind. Nor does Eusebius, although he enumerates the orders of the Church, perhaps fifty times in his history. Nor does one of the councils, either general or provincial. And if we go into the third century, nothing is to be found there in your favour—nothing in Origen, Clemens of Alexandria, and Tertullian—nothing in Irenæus, or any writer of the second century. Supposing then that your testimonies were good for the fourth century, still the rule of Lirinensis and St. Augustine totally fails. The institution cannot be supported by *antiquity*, *universality*, and *general consent;* and, therefore, is, not apostolic.

On the account I have given of this whole matter from the learned Bingham and Albaspinæus, you cheer yourself with a laugh. They say, there were *Seniores Ecclesiæ*, [Elders of the Church,] who were chosen to assist the Bishop with their advice in the weighty affairs of the Church; and also Seniores Ecclesiastici, [ecclesiastical Elders,] who were entrusted with the treasures and outward affairs of the Church, as our Vestries are; but neither of them is considered by them as of apostolic institution. The *Seniores Ecclesiæ*, you say, were the *Lay* Elders of your Church. And you add, 'It is really laughable to find Dr. B. conceding in substance all that we desire; and yet, on account of some petty points of difference, which are too frivolous to be noticed, and which do not affect the main question, insisting that there is nothing like our *Lay Elders* to be found in primitive times.'

Now, Sir, the 'petty points of difference' are the following: The *Seniores Ecclesiæ* were not of apostolic institution; you say your *Lay Elders* are. This, to be sure, is a very 'petty point of difference.' The *former* were not a component part of the Presbytery; the *latter* are. Another 'petty point.' The *Seniores Ecclesiæ* had nothing to do with examining candidates for the ministry—with resolving questions of doctrine or discipline—with condemning erroneous opinions—with ordaining and judging of ministers. Six more 'petty points of difference.' But still, no doubt, the inference is good, sound, and logical. The *Seniores Ecclesiæ* differ in eight important points from Presbyterian *Lay Elders;* therefore they are the same. Certainly, I deserve to be laughed at for asserting there is nothing to be found like Lay Elders in primitive times!

Next we are presented with a curiosity of another kind. A quotation is given from the *Apostolic Constitutions.* Till now they were not worth regarding; too corrupt to be depended upon; but suddenly they are freed from their stains, and are very good evidence for Lay Elders. Another circumstance in

Digitized by Google

this curiosity is, that they were composed between the *second* and fifth centuries; but you do not tell us when the words quoted were written, whether in the third or fourth century. If in the fourth, the quotation is not worth a straw, if Hilary speaks truth; and if in the *third*, there is not a shadow to be found for *Lay* Elders, but the words of this quotation. Let us then examine them. Thus they run—"To Presbyters also, when they labour in *teaching*, let a double portion be assigned." On this you say, 'Here is, obviously, a distinction between Elders who are employed in *teaching*, and those who are *not* so employed.' If it were *obvious*, I think that I am not so blind, but that I should perceive it. The only distinction that I can perceive is that of *labouring*, or being laborious in preaching, and not being so. If the distinction you wish to establish was intended, the words would have been, "To Presbyters also, when they labour in *teaching*, let a portion be assigned double to that of *Ruling* Elders." This would be clear; but in none of your quotations is there any language that has the least claim to perspicuity; nor is even the *title* given in Scripture, or in all antiquity. I doubt, whether there ever was a stronger instance of prejudice, than is afforded by the frequent attempts that have been made to establish *Lay* Elders on apostolic usage; while, at the same time, their advocates can resist the numerous, positive, and direct testimonies of the first five centuries in favour of the apostolic origin of episcopacy. But so it is; episcopacy has been abandoned by a *few;* and that *few*, we may be assured, will never cease opposing it.

If I could be surprised at any quotation you may think proper to give, it would be at your mentioning Bishop Taylor as granting, that a set of men, called *Seniors*, existed in the Church at an early period. You cannot tell us where the acknowledgment is made, but you are sure it is to be found somewhere. This, I suppose, is quite sufficient to balance my long quotation from him *against* Lay Elders; quite sufficient to balance a whole chapter in his *Episcopacy Asserted*, *against* them; quite sufficient to balance the following strong language: "The thing is so evident [that there were never any Lay Elders in the Church] that it is next to impudence to say that, in antiquity laymen were parties and assessors in the consistory of the Church. It was against their faith; it was against their practice;" and, speaking of the quotations from Ambrose and Austin, he says, "they are but like sophisms to prove that two and two are not four; for to pretend such slight, airy imaginations against the constant, known, open catholic practice and doctrine of the Church, and history of all ages, is as if a man should go to fight an imperial army with a single bulrush."[1]

You next endeavour to force Ignatius into the service of Ruling Elders. I really thought that I had so completely settled

1 *Episcopacy Asserted*, p. 165.

Digitized by Google

this point, that you would not have ventured to say one word more upon the subject. But you possess a hardihood that is not easily diminished. In your second attempt, you do not produce a single instance in all the Epistles of Ignatius, of a distinction between *Ruling* and *Preaching* Elders. Now, is it not an extraordinary thing, that when the holy martyr so often enumerates the different orders of the Church, he should never once mention *Ruling* or *Lay Elders?*

In my Eighth Letter I gave a few instances, out of many that might have been given, of the utter impossibility of making the Epistles of Ignatius accord with the notion of Ruling Elders. Let me repeat in substance what I there said. 1. "I exhort you, that you study to do all things in a divine concord—your Presbyters (both *Preaching* and *Ruling* Presbyters) in the place of the council of Apostles; and your Deacons being intrusted with the ministry of JESUS CHRIST."—'Your *Ruling* Elders in the place of the council of the Apostles.' This cannot be true in any sense, as the *Ruling* Elders did not preach nor administer the sacraments. How then could they stand in the place of the Apostles? 2. "Let no man do any thing of what belongs to the Church without the Bishop. Let that eucharist be looked upon as valid, which is either offered by the Bishop, or by him (*Preaching* or *Ruling* Elder) to whom the Bishop has given his consent." You certainly will not allow your *Ruling* Elder, even with the Bishop's leave, to celebrate the eucharist. 3. "It is not lawful without the Bishop (for *Preaching* or *Ruling* Elders) either to baptize or to celebrate the holy communion." Would any Bishop among you give leave to a *Ruling* Elder to baptize? Now, what is your answer to all this? It is, 'even supposing his Presbyters to be *Ruling Elders*, and supposing him to mean, that they with the Bishop's (or Pastor's leave) *might* administer both sacraments; this would only show that Ignatius was in an error, as Tertullian was after him, who, in his work *De Baptismo*, after asserting that the administration of baptism was *appropriated* to the office of Bishop, does not scruple to say, that even a layman may baptize with the Bishop's leave.' This is a curious specimen of reasoning! You first take for granted that Ignatius had Ruling Elders, and then say correctly enough, that he was wrong to permit them to administer the sacraments. This is connecting a just observation with a supposed fact, for the purpose of making the observation prove the fact. Your business is to show from the Epistles, that *in fact*, there *were* Ruling Elders in the Churches to which he writes; of which there is not the most distant appearance; not one expression that can be tortured to that meaning. If a man be allowed to argue in this manner, he may prove any thing.

It is absolutely incredible that Ignatius should mention Deacons over and over again, and yet never once hint that there was an officer in the Church inferior to *preaching* Presbyters, but superior to Deacons. What sort of a writer is he, who, in

Digitized by Google

his repeated enumerations of officers, whether civil, military, or ecclesiastical, mentions the lowest grade, but never once the grade immediately above it? Would not every one suppose that there was no such grade?

After you have given us your store of proofs from the *Gesta*, Austin, and Ambrose, in the fourth century, and after a feeble attempt to draw Ruling Elders from the Epistles of Ignatius, you give us several testimonies from foreign divines in favour of Ruling Elders. But to what does this amount? Just thus much —that there were such officers in the Churches to which they belong, and, in their opinion, in the primitive Church. You might just as well have given us a list of your own ministers, who believe in the apostolic institution of that office. If numbers are to decide the question, you know very well that we can produce fifty to one against you. You had better, therefore, avoid this mode of deciding it. I have tried the question by the proper evidence, Scripture and antiquity; and there it is very evident you have no support whatever. Could we give no more proof of episcopacy than you do of Ruling Elders, I am sure we should make a very ridiculous figure. And how you can reject the one and cling to the other, when there is not the least comparison between the evidence, is, to me, one of the most extraordinary instances of prejudice that can possibly be named. But the human mind is a strange thing; it can close itself against the clearest evidence, when it does not correspond with its prepossessions, and be satisfied with the most insufficient, when it does.

You have given us, Sir, two quotations from Archbishop Whitgift, to prove his favourable opinion of the apostolic institution of ruling Elders. It is very unaccountable how you can quote him for your purpose. If you have read him, you must know, that he rejects Scripture warrant for *Lay* Elders. On the text in the first Epistle to Timothy, he says—"Although St. Paul makes a distinction, yet it is certain, that under this name *Seniors*, he doth comprehend such only as the ministers of the word or sacraments. And I have before sufficiently proved, that the administration of the sacraments may be committed to some, to whom the preaching of the word of God is not committed. And this distinction of ministers doth this place very well justify."[m] He then quotes Chrysostom, Jerome, and Ambrose against your sense of the text.

Again: He says to Cartwright, "But I pray you do thus much for me. First, prove that there was in every congregation such as you call *Seniors*. When you have done that, then show me that that office, and kind of regimen, ought to be perpetual, and not rather to be altered according to the state and condition of the Church. Last of all, that those *Seniors* were lay men, as we call them, and not rather ministers of the word and Bishops."[n]

m Page 628 n Page 627.

Digitized by Google

Further: "Where hath the Apostle, in all that Epistle, (1 Tim.) spoken one word of the office of your *Seniors*, which you distinguish from a minister of the word? Where doth he give any such commandment concerning his office? Where doth he prescribe any such form and kind of government? If he keep silence in this matter through the whole Epistle, how dare you presume to say that to be commanded, which is not mentioned, and to make so much ado about nothing?"[o]

Once more: "Examples of Churches there may be some, but not of your kind of *Seniors*. Precept and commandment for this kind of government, there is not one in the whole Scripture, or in any approved authority."[p]

The opinion of Whitgift with respect to Lay Elders is just this:—He believed there were, in *some* Churches, a bench of Elders, who were consulted in the affairs of the Church, particularly in times of persecution; but that this was a matter of mere human expediency. And this he grounds altogether on the testimony of Hilary. But Scripture warrant, either of precept or example, he utterly rejects.

To conclude: I have consulted Guise, one of your own ministers, and I find he is against the Elders of his own Church, as you will find by turning to the place. I have also consulted the *Continuation of Poole's Synopsis by a Number of Hands.* They give the different opinions on the text in Timothy, but appear not to be able to give any for themselves.

And now what a strange thing it is, that an order of men superior to Deacons, and possessing spiritual authority, should be founded on a text of Scripture, which, to say the most of it, is perfectly ambiguous, and which has neither *antiquity* nor *universality* to countenance the interpretation given to it! If the advocates of *papal supremacy* had not more to say for themselves than you have to say for *Lay Elders*, I doubt very much whether they would not shrink from all dispute with Protestants, on the Pope's unwarrantable usurpation.

I shall now sum up, in a few words, the testimony of the fathers.

It is a universally received principle, that when a constant and uniform series of evidence for any fact is carried up to within a few years of the time when it happened, the fact is completely established. I have produced numerous testimonies from the writers and councils of the fourth century, that episcopacy was the government of the Church in that age. This you admit. I have also shown, from their explicit declarations, that they believed this regimen was of apostolic or divine institution. Jerome, as well as others, does most positively declare it to be so. His list of Bishops he runs up to apostolic appointment. In his whole series, he does not once give any note of distinction between the Bishops of his day, and those of the apostolic

o Page 637. p Page 638.

Digitized by Google

age. He must have been destitute of common sense to give a catalogue of Bishops up to that source, if episcopacy had not begun till the second or third century. He must have been destitute of common honesty, to impose upon the world a succession of officers holding the same commission, when those of the first age held an essentially different commission. Precisely the same may be said of Eusebius, of Tertullian, and of Irenæus. They always designate the Bishop by the name of the city in which he resided, and never intimate that a mere Presbyter was the chief Pastor. They speak of numerous Presbyters and numerous congregations being in the principal cities; and that the Bishop presided over the whole; and, consequently, that he was a *Diocesan*. They give no intimation of any change in this particular, after the first century. In this high sense, they make Bishops the *successors of the Apostles*, and never once intimate that Presbyters succeeded to a *supremacy* of apostolic power. In the third century, Cyprian, and a great number of other writers, found episcopacy on apostolic and divine institution, and not one tittle can be produced from their writings to the contrary. In the close of the second century, Clemens of Alexandria, Tertullian, and others still earlier, rest episcopacy on the same ground; and not so much as a shadow of evidence can be produced from them, that they thought it was a human invention. And in the beginning of that age, Ignatius, over and over again, enumerates the different orders of the Church, and repeatedly enjoins the inferior orders to be subject in spiritual matters to the Bishop, and declares this subordination of officers to be of divine appointment. And so complete is this evidence, that the most learned Presbyterian writers have never been able to show in what age prelacy commenced, short of the apostolic. The wide difference among them, proves almost to a demonstration, that there is not a single circumstance that can be advanced to prove episcopacy a human institution. And if this *antiquity*, this *universality*, and this *general consent* will not convince a man that episcopacy is a divine institution, all the principles of evidence must be given up, and we must govern ourselves, as to matters of fact, by whim, by prejudice, or by party spirit.

This constant and uniform testimony of ancient writers to the apostolic origin of episcopacy, affords an argument level to every capacity, and leaves no room whatever to fanciful conjecture concerning a change. A change could not possibly have taken place between the time when the canon of Scripture was closed, and the time when the Epistles of Ignatius were written. Nor will it help you in the least to pitch upon a period in the second or third century. Whatever time you may select, the fact that a change took place, must be proved by clear and substantial evidence. But this has never been done, nor ever attempted to be done with the least plausibility. The conjectures on this point are so wild, so extravagant, and so different in respect of time, that every impartial person must say, that your writers

Digitized by Google

know nothing about the matter. Take any period you please, ascribe the change to any motive you please, still we can show that you are in the region of chimeras. If you choose the second, or the third century, produce the record of the fact, name the author who mentions it, tell us the circumstance on which you found your conjecture, and we will give the evidence, whatever it may be, a fair and candid examination. This you have not done; this, in effect, you acknowledge you *cannot* do. Agree among yourselves, to what source this corruption (as you speak) is to be ascribed. *You* say, it was owing to depravity; Dr. Campbell says it was owing to piety. A wider difference there cannot possibly be. Piety, then, according to him, consists in disobeying a divine institution. Piety pretends to more wisdom than CHRIST possesses. Piety persuaded men out of their senses. Piety asserted a falsehood. Piety stopped the mouth, and arrested the pen of every Christian writer. Away with such conjectures! They are too gross, too palpably absurd for the belief even of children.

But perhaps corruption stands a better chance of succeeding. This corruption on which you place so much dependence, was confined either to the few ambitious prelates, or it was general among the clergy and laity. If the *former*, how came the corrupt ambition of the *few* to prevail over the piety and purity of the *many?* Ambition must be supported either by the arm of power, or by popularity. The civil arm was extended for the destruction of the whole Church, and not for the support of any particular order in it. Popularity is out of the question; for by the supposition, the great body of the clergy, and the laity being pure, must necessarily have been opposed to the ambition of the prelates; and their opposition must necessarily have defeated the scheme. It then remains that there was a general corruption among the clergy and laity; and that out of this corrupt mass, a few enterprizing, ambitious men, acquired a superiority over their brethren. But would not this general corruption produce general ambition? Would not this general ambition have produced the most serious commotions, the most violent conflicts, the most inveterate party spirit, the most scandalous intrigues, and, of course, the most disastrous consequences to the Church? If success attended the prelates (as it seems was the case) would not resentment have produced remonstrance from the clergy and laity? Would not every mouth have been open, every tongue have been employed against such an iniquitous usurpation? Would *every* page of history, *every* sentence of the fathers have been free from complaint? Would all have become so suddenly, and so much in love with this successful attempt as to hush it up; and that so completely as to prevent a single hint of it from descending to posterity? If men can believe these things, they certainly can believe any thing that suits their prejudice.

But perhaps the change was brought about by very slow and imperceptible degrees. The very nature of episcopacy precludes

Digitized by Google

that. If any change took place, it must have been all at once. It was a change from *congregational* parity to *diocesan* imparity. It was the assumption of an important prerogative, *that of ordaining* the clergy. This indeed would necessarily draw after it some others. Now could any subtlety have effected this? Could any art have persuaded the Presbyters that they had no right to ordain, when they had been all along, from the apostolic age, exercising that right? Could a moderatorship, though for life, have led to this result? Could your moderators ever persuade their brethren, that they had no right to ordain? Would it be possible, by any art or subtlety, to convert all the Presbyterians in the world into Episcopalians? I am sure you will think the question ridiculous. But ridiculous as it is, the change took place upon your hypothesis. It took place, too, nobody knows *where*, nor *when*. What! were Presbyterians differently constituted *then* from what they are *now*? Were they so corrupt as to change presbytery for episcopacy? Or so blind as not to see what was going forward against their rights? Or so mild as to shut their mouths against usurpation? Or so perfectly convinced that presbytery was a bad government, that it was necessary to change it? One or more of these things must be assigned; and whichever may be assigned, it proves a bad cause supported by contemptible assumption.

This refuge, therefore, that episcopacy was gradually and imperceptibly introduced, is effectually precluded by the very nature of the institution. There is but a step from *parity* to *imparity*. The imparity in this case is the assumption of an exclusive right of ordaining. This must be assumed at once, or not at all; for there is no intermediate step from the floor of equality to the chair of superiority. The ascension into that chair depended solely, after the apostolic age, upon the simple circumstance of election. Could the Presbyters, (and if you please join the people with them,) elect a man to the episcopal office, and not know that they were electing him? The object was specific, the elevation of one man above his fellows. The office was well known; the authority on which it rested was well known. The mere pretence to apostolic usage could have deceived no man. All knew the practice of their own time; all knew the practice of the times before them, from infallible testimony. None complained; none uttered a syllable of discontent. *Universality* and *antiquity* pronounced episcopacy a divine institution.

The conceit, then, that episcopacy is the fruit of corruption, and that it was introduced imperceptibly, is perfectly ridiculous; and every attempt that has been made by ingenuity to give plausibility to this conceit, does but prove the position, that prelacy is not the work of man, but of God.

As it is probable that I shall have to recur to this train of reasoning, I shall not pursue it any further in this place; but shall proceed to review the Scripture proofs of episcopal pre-

Digitized by Google

eminence. I shall begin with what we deem proof for this pre-eminence in Timothy and Titus.

1. The office of a Bishop implies the exclusive right of ordaining. This was committed to Timothy—*Lay hands suddenly on no man.* To this you reply with some warmth—'Shall we never have done with this begging of the whole question, in a manner so unworthy of logicians and divines? Suppose they were empowered to ordain? What then? Do we not consider Presbyters as invested with this power? And is it not the great object of Dr. B.'s book to show that it was otherwise? Why then does he attempt to impose upon his readers by taking the main point for granted?' Curious enough! I take the main point for granted, when I produce from the Scriptures several passages, which show that the power of ordaining is not given to Presbyters. And to prove that it was not given to them, I show from the express words of the text, that those very Presbyters, and all orders in the Church, were subjected to Timothy's authority. Now, if those who govern, and those who are governed, are of the same order, then I certainly beg the question; but if they are not; if authority implies superiority, and superiority inferiority, then I certainly gain my point.

Lay hands suddenly on no man;—that is, do not admit into the sacred ministry any without due examination. Is there any one associated with Timothy in this injunction? None. There were Presbyters at Ephesus, but they are not so much as mentioned. Can we then infer from this text that they had a right to ordain? Certainly we cannot. Where then in the Scripture shall we find it? Is it in the transaction at Miletus? St. Paul sent from Miletus to Ephesus, and *called the Elders of the Church.* When they arrived, the Apostle gave them this solemn charge—*Take heed, therefore, unto yourselves, and to all the flock over which the* HOLY GHOST *hath made you overseers, to feed the Church of* GOD, *which he hath purchased with his own blood.* Here is not the least intimation to these Presbyters, that their commission implied the power of ordaining. There is no mention of the qualifications requisite for the persons that were to be ordained; nothing but to take care of their own conduct, and to feed with the word of life those over whom they were placed. But he gives very particular directions to Timothy, concerning those Presbyters whom he should ordain. Is it not wonderful that St. Paul should not intimate in these two texts, that Presbyters were commissioned to ordain, when the occasions so naturally required it? Again: St. Paul charges Timothy *not to receive an accusation against an Elder but before two or three witnesses;* but he gives no such charge to the Elders or Overseers of Ephesus. He also says to Timothy, *Them*, the Elders, *that sin, rebuke before all, that others also may fear.* Nothing can be more absurd than to suppose, that those Elders who were subject to the censures of Timothy, were possessed of equal powers with him.

Digitized by Google

Further: The very maintenance of the Elders St. Paul commits entirely to Timothy, and to him alone. *Let the Elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honour; especially they who labour in the word and doctrine.* All agree that this is a charge to take care that the Elders be maintained. But there is no intimation that the Elders are to be associated with him.

Once more: To Timothy is committed authority to order divine service—to see that all things are done decently in the Church—to give rules concerning Christian discipline—to take care that no widows be taken into the service of the Church under sixty years of age—that none be ordained who were novices—that women should go modestly apparelled, should keep silence in the Church, and not teach—that prayers should be made for kings and all in authority—that men should not lift up their hands in prayer when full of strife—that none should be admitted into the office of Deacon without trial; nor any be raised to a higher office who had not acquitted himself well in the Deaconship; and, finally, to correct heretical and disorderly persons, to stop their mouths, and to excommunicate them.

Now, to show that all this was addressed to Timothy, as the head of the Church of Ephesus, the Apostle solemnly concludes —*I give thee charge in the sight of* GOD, *who quickeneth all things, and before* JESUS CHRIST, *who before Pontius Pilate witnessed a good confession, that thou keep this commandment, without spot, unrebukeable, until the appearance of our* LORD JESUS CHRIST. Here the Apostle plainly tells us, that the *command* relating to the above points, was given to Timothy for his direction and conduct in the Church of CHRIST, and that he, of course, would be responsible for the breach of it. And he also plainly informs us, that the same charge was applicable to Timothy's successors. For it was to be kept *until the appearing of our* LORD JESUS CHRIST. Now he knew perfectly well that Timothy would not live till the day of judgment. The charge, therefore, was extended to the office which he bore till the end of time; and was of the nature of that promise which CHRIST made to his Apostles, that he would *be with them*, that is, with their office, *to the end of the world.* But the charge given by the Apostle to the Elders of Ephesus was merely personal; it related to nothing beyond their lives. As they had no power to ordain others in their room, so there is no charge given to them to *keep what was committed to them to the coming of* CHRIST, or *to commit what they had received to faithful men.*

Now, Sir, if there are words in the whole compass of language which can express episcopal power, we have them in the Epistles to Timothy. How then can you, consistently with truth, charge me with begging the question? Timothy's superiority over the whole Church of Ephesus, is as clear as the sun in the firmament. How then can you say, that I impose upon

Digitized by Google

my readers? Where is the decency, where is the modesty of this?

It is pretty generally allowed by Presbyterian writers, that Timothy was superior to the Presbyters of Ephesus. I can quote several; but I shall give you no more than one; and that one is Doctor Mason. In the *Christian's Magazine*, Vol. II. No. 2, p. 216, he asks—"What do these long extracts, with their glowing interrogations, prove? [Extracts from Cyprian and the Layman.] 'Why, that Timothy and Titus were superior to Presbyters!' Who denies it! 'What! do you allow that they had, severally, the power of ordaining to the ministry, by their sole authority?' Yes, we do. 'That they had authority to inquire into the doctrines taught by the Presbyters?' Yes. 'To coerce the unruly?' Yes. 'To expel the heretical?' Yes—we never thought of disputing it. 'Then, certainly, they were diocesan Bishops.'—C'est une autre affaire, Monsieur. [French, I suppose.] This is another point. We admit the premises here stated, but deny the conclusion. Timothy and Titus could do all these things without being diocesan Bishops. An Apostle could do them in virtue of his apostolic office. An Evangelist, as Timothy, and consequently Titus, undoubtedly was, could do them in consequence of his office *as an Evangelist;* and yet be very unlike a diocesan Bishop."

It seems then, according to Doctor Mason, that Timothy and Titus were superior to Presbyters; but it was in consequence of their being *Evangelists*, and not *diocesan* Bishops. Here the Doctor proceeds upon a wrong supposition. He supposes that the *fixedness* of a Bishop is essential to the character, and that we consider it in that light. A man may be a Bishop or a Presbyter without being fixed to any particular diocese or parish; he may be an itinerant all his life, in either character. It is the power exercised which characterizes the office, whether that power be exercised by a stationary or by an itinerant officer, for a longer or a shorter time. But this superiority, according to the Doctor, resulted from Timothy's being an Evangelist, and not from his being a diocesan; and the character of an Evangelist was *extraordinary*, and not to be continued in the Church. Well, then; while Timothy was at Ephesus, there were three orders there—Timothy, the superior, and Presbyters, and Deacons. This is the necessary result of the Doctor's conclusion. How now does it appear, that the office of an Evangelist was extraordinary? Not from the New Testament; for there is not a tittle in it to that purpose; nor has so much as a shadow been produced by either Dr. Mason or yourself. Does the nature of the office show that it was extraordinary? What *was* the nature of the office? According to Dr. Campbell, the word from which the term *Evangelist* is derived, "relates to the first information that is given to a person or people, that is, when the subject may be properly called *news*." Thus, "in the Acts," he says, "it is frequently used for expressing the first publication of the

Digitized by Google

Gospel in a city, or a village, or among a particular people."[p] And, in his fourth lecture, he acknowledges, that the word "denotes properly, to *preach*, or declare the good news—that is, the Gospel—to those who had before known nothing of the matter." In this sense, then, most certainly, an Evangelist was not an extraordinary officer; for as long as there are any people to be converted to the faith of CHRIST, so long this office must continue. If we take the word in a less restrained sense, as meaning *preaching* to those who had heard the Gospel before; in this sense, surely, the office of an Evangelist was not extraordinary: for in this sense, every fixed pastor is an Evangelist, and if he preach among the Heathen, in the other sense also. There being then nothing in the Scripture against the perpetuity of the office, nor in its nature, in whatever sense you take it; it follows irresistibly, that an Evangelist was not an extraordinary officer; and, consequently, that Timothy's authority at Ephesus was founded on an episcopal commission to rule all orders in that Church.

What further shows that Timothy was not an extraordinary officer is, that he actually had successors in the office he held in the Church of Ephesus. I quoted in my ninth letter, no less than ten testimonies from the fathers, that he was the first Bishop of Ephesus. And I might have added, that Ignatius, in his Epistle to the Ephesians, names Onesimus Bishop of that Church, who must have been either the first or second successor to Timothy. This succession of an individual to the government of a Church, in which were many Presbyters, and many congregations, is a decisive proof of diocesan episcopacy. So that both Scripture and antiquity prove the fact, that Timothy was the first Bishop of Ephesus.

But still he was an Evangelist, and therefore not a *diocesan*, that is, a *fixed* Bishop. But how does this prove, supposing it to be true, that he was not a Bishop? You must prove from Scripture, or from the nature of the office, that an Evangelist could not be a Bishop. But no mortal has ever yet proved this, from the days of Prynne, of precious memory, down to the present controversy. It has ever been assumed: you assume it—Dr. Mason assumes it; and then, no doubt, Timothy was not Bishop of Ephesus.

It has always astonished me, that men of sense should allow Timothy's superiority over the Presbyters of Ephesus, and yet deny that he was their Bishop. If pre-eminence be granted, as it is by the best Presbyterian writers, and as it is expressly by Dr. Mason, it matters not one straw what you call Timothy. The only question remaining is, had he successors? This cannot be proved from Scripture, but from the primitive writers. These to a man, who mention Timothy, are in our favour. The great Council of Chalcedon, in the fourth century, assert that

---

p *Preliminary Dissertations to Translation of the Gospels*, p. 203.

Digitized by Google

there was a succession of twenty-seven Bishops to their time, and give us the names of several of them. And is it not most reprehensible assurance, that men living fourteen hundred years after that Council, should refuse to acknowledge a succession of diocesan Bishops? Steadfastness, on rational grounds, is commendable; but, in opposition to facts, it becomes perverseness and obstinacy.

But still, it seems to be sufficient for your purpose, that St. Paul calls Timothy an Evangelist; and you roundly assert that I contradict the Apostle. *He* says, *Do the work af an Evangelist—I* say, Timothy was not an Evangelist to the Ephesians, as the term implies proclaiming the joyful news of the Gospel to those who had not heard it before. Now, could Timothy, in this sense, *do the work of an Evangelist* to the Ephesians, when St. Paul had been preaching to them the Gospel for three years? You must say No, whether you like it or not. In the name of decency then, why do you tell me that I contradict the Apostle? Do I say that Timothy was not an Evangelist to the Ephesians in *any* sense? Quite the contrary; I say that he *was;* but only as the preacher of joyful tidings they had often heard. Timothy, when the second Epistle was written, was on his charge at Ephesus. This was, at the very least, three years after the date of the first Epistle; some make it a good deal more. Now, how did Timothy discharge the duty of an Evangelist during that time? He evidently had the care of the Church of Ephesus. He certainly was there when the second Epistle was written to him; and that, certainly, was three years after the first. In no other possible way then could he have acted as an Evangelist, than by assiduously preaching the Gospel to the Christians in Ephesus, and the neighbouring region.

There never was, I believe, such a tissue of assumptions and misrepresentations, as you have exhibited in your observations on the case of Timothy. You assume that he was *a special missionary*—you assume that *an Evangelist* was an *extraordinary* officer—you assume that he was sent to regulate an unorganized Church—you assume that he was not fixed at Ephesus—you assume that a Bishop is attached to a particular place—you assume, in short, that Timothy was not the sole ordainer; and then you accommodate yourself with a conclusion to your mind, viz. that Timothy was not Bishop of Ephesus. But the misfortune attending all this is, that it is directly in the face of St. Paul's Epistles.

You go on to observe that 'Dr. B. and his friends also lay great stress on another point. They take for granted that there had been Elders (or Presbyters) ordained by the Apostle Paul himself, both at Ephesus and Crete, before Timothy and Titus were sent to those places. Assuming this as a fact, they say, these Presbyters, on Presbyterian principles, must have been invested with the ordaining power; but if this were so, why were others sent on so long a journey, to perform that which

Digitized by Google

persons on the spot could have done as well? Here again every thing is taken for granted. Where did Dr. B. learn there had been Presbyters fixed, either in Ephesus, or Crete, before Timothy and Titus went thither? The sacred history says no such thing. With what face then can any man undertake to found his whole argument on a mere assumption?"

I really, Sir, do not know what to do with you. Your confidence is unparalleled. Your misrepresentations are too frequent; too bad. You coolly tell your readers that I assume the fact, that there were Elders at Ephesus, before St. Paul sent Timothy thither, when my book, in which I detail the proofs, was in your hand. What shall we say to this?

I will again detail the proofs, as you have rendered it necessary. In my Ninth Letter,[r] I thus speak—'By settling the time of Timothy's appointment to the see of Ephesus, we have secured another point, which you represent as assumed by us without any proof; that is, that there were Elders at Ephesus before Timothy's appointment. I should suppose that no one could possibly doubt of this, were even no mention made of it, when he considers that Paul assures us, that he had spent three years preaching the gospel throughout that region. To suppose that there were no Presbyters ordained during that time, when there were so many thousands converted to the faith, is one of those monstrous presumptions, which candid and impartial men will not admit. But, Sir, we have no need to have recourse to *a priori* reasoning. The fact is clear enough. Timothy, after he was commissioned by St. Paul to govern the Church of Ephesus, went before him to Troas, at which place Paul arrived from Philippi, in five days. They stayed there seven, Timothy going by water, and Paul by land to Assos, where Paul embarked, and proceeded to Miletus. At that place, the Apostle sent for the Presbyters of Ephesus and the neighbouring region. Here then, we find Elders, before Timothy had entered upon his charge; and we find St. Paul left Miletus without Timothy, and proceeded on his voyage to Jerusalem, where he was apprehended and sent a prisoner to Rome. After some time, he sent for Timothy, who, by the second letter, we see, was at Ephesus.' After these decisive proofs of the fact, you tell your readers that I have assumed it. Is this one of the ways by which, according to Dr. Romeyn, you have gained a victory?

'But,' you say, 'admitting that there were Elders already ordained both at Ephesus and Crete, still the argument is good for nothing. That some portion of those Churches were unfurnished with ministers of any kind, and that they were all in a comparatively unorganized and immature state, is perfectly manifest from the whole strain of the Apostle's language concerning them. Was it unnatural, on Presbyterian principles, that

r Page 261, 262. [Vol. I. p. 126, 127.]

Digitized by Google

in this state of things, *special missionaries* should be sent among them; men well known as possessing the entire confidence of the Apostles; fully instructed in their duty, and qualified to travel from place to place, and *set in order the things which were wanting?* Might not many prudential considerations have rendered it expedient to send such eminent characters from a distance, rather than to select men of less distinguished and commanding reputation on the spot, to perform a service, as delicate as it was arduous?'

Now, Sir, every tittle of this, as to the Church of Ephesus, is mere fancy. That Church, upon Presbyterian principles, was completely organized. It had Presbyters and Deacons, and, if you are right, Ruling Elders; and it does not appear from the Epistles of Timothy, that there was any disorder, or any thing wanting, to render it necessary to send a *special missionary* to do what the Presbyters could have done without him. If St. Paul had been determined to sow the seed of discontent, he could not have taken a more effectual method than to send Timothy to rule that Church, which, by divine institution, (if you are to be confided in) was under the government of a Presbytery. Was not that Presbytery competent to the government of the Church over which it presided? Then CHRIST instituted a government which required a superior power to control it. A *special missionary*, it seems, was necessary to regulate its affairs. An admirable specimen of the wisdom of CHRIST! The power of the Presbyters to ordain was taken out of their hands, and placed in the hands of Timothy. The government was, in the first instance, committed to them, but they abused it, which rendered it necessary to give them a superior. And according to the ancients, this necessity continued ever after; for they assure us that Timothy had his successors.

With what facility all difficulties are removed by the touch of your pen! The Presbyters of Ephesus are first blotted out of existence; then appears an unorganized Church; next, a *special missionary* to give it full vigour and proportion; and when the man did his business, he disappears; and thus episcopacy is shut out from Ephesus.

'But,' you say, 'Dr. B. further contends, that Timothy and Titus were empowered to ordain *alone;* that is, that in the ordinations which they performed at Ephesus and Crete, there were no other ordainers joined with them; and hence he infers that the Presbyterian doctrine cannot be true, because our rules do not admit of ordination by a single Presbyter. Hence, once more, this dextrous disputant takes for granted the very thing to be proved. Who informed him that Timothy was the sole ordainer at Ephesus, and Titus at Crete? The Epistles to those Evangelists do not say so—yet he assumes facts, and argues upon them with as much confidence as if he were perfectly acquainted with every minute particular.' And in a note, you

Digitized by Google

present to me the following dilemma. 'If there were *none such* [Presbyters] at Ephesus or Crete, before the Evangelist was sent, then a fundamental argument in favour of the prelatical character of Timothy and Titus is destroyed. If there *were* such, then they might have assisted, for aught we know, in every ordination: and then another boasted argument on the same side falls to the ground. Whichever supposition is adopted, it is equally fatal.'

It is a fundamental rule with respect to a dilemma, that when it can be retorted, it is good for nothing. Thus, if there were no Presbyters at Ephesus, then he had none to assist him 'for aught we know.' If there *were*, they were not united with him, if the Epistles are to be our guide. Whether, therefore, there were Presbyters or not, he was the sole ordainer, 'for aught we know.' Your dilemma then proves just nothing; and the question remains still to be proved, whether he was the *sole* ordainer.

That Timothy, and all of his order, and not Presbyters, had the power of ordaining, I thus prove. The power committed to certain persons to do certain things in the Church, is considered by all sober men as excluding those to whom the power is not committed. It is not necessary to mention in express terms, that all others are excluded. The very nature of a commission excludes them. Thus, CHRIST's choosing twelve Apostles, excluded all those whom he did not choose, from exercising the office of an Apostle. Thus, also, when men were ordained Presbyters and Deacons, none that were not so ordained could exercise those offices. This is so obvious, that none but fanatics will deny it. This is the ground of the distinction between the clergy and the laity. The clergy then are a positive institution, as much so as the sacraments; and by consequence, every order of the clergy is a positive institution. Now, different orders imply different powers; for it is a difference of power which constitutes a difference of order. In the Church of Ephesus, there were three different orders—Timothy the Evangelist, Presbyters, and Deacons. Timothy then was superior to the other two orders. In what this superiority consisted, can be determined in no other way than by the Epistles directed to him. All the points of superiority have been already detailed—regulating divine worship—taking care of the maintenance of the clergy—admonishing, censuring, excommunicating both clergy and laity; and lastly, ordaining to sacred offices. Put Timothy on a footing with the Presbyters in the last particular, then you have no evidence whatever that he was superior in the other particulars; for they all stand precisely upon the same ground, viz. St. Paul's empowering him to do certain things, without, in a single instance, associating with him either clergy or laity; just as our SAVIOUR's giving certain powers to his Apostles, without naming the laity, makes the one superior to the other. And the laity of Ephesus, had they reasoned as you do, might with as much propriety have claimed a right to ordain, because

Digitized by Google

they were not expressly excluded, as you have to claim a right for the Presbyters of Ephesus to ordain, because they were not expressly excluded. The commission running in Timothy's name, necessarily excluded all others; as the commission running in the Apostles' names, necessarily excluded all others. The direction to Timothy to censure and excommunicate, virtually excluded every one else from doing it; and the injunction *to lay hands suddenly on no man*, with the directions relating to the qualifications of Presbyters and Deacons, prove him to be the judge and the ordainer; and if this reasoning be not admitted, there is no proof whatever of any distinction between clergy and laity.

Consider also what I have already intimated, that taking the government of the Church out of the hands of the Presbyters, was a most effectual way of throwing the Church of Ephesus into the utmost confusion. The Epistles carry on the face of them a commission to Timothy to govern that Church—carry on the face of them a commission to ordain Deacons and Elders. If the latter then had power to ordain, might they not have told Timothy—"We have chosen Elders already, and laid our hands upon them; that if he alone was allowed to exercise this power, it might seem as if he alone had it; or that ministers were the better for being ordained by his particular hands; and that some persons might imagine they could have no clergy, except they were ordained by him, or some of his order; and that seeing CHRIST had no where made an express law, that such persons should be necessary to the ordination of the clergy, therefore they rejected this authority of Timothy." (Law's *Second Letter*.)

Again: *Charge them* (the Presbyters) *that they teach no other doctrine.* If Timothy was not the Governor of the Church of Ephesus, then the Presbyters might have said to him—"We believe our doctrine to be true; but if not true, we are not accountable to you for it; for you and we stand upon a level. If therefore you would subject us to your censures, you take too much upon you, and usurp a power to which you have no right." What an admirable expedient to preserve the Church of Ephesus in profound peace, in strict discipline, and in pure doctrine!

To conclude: Timothy acted in the Church of Ephesus as an Evangelist, or as a Presbyter, or as a Bishop. If as an Evangelist, then an Evangelist was necessary to the government of that Church; unless we can suppose that the Apostle did what was unnecessary. If necessary, then no reason can be assigned why a successor of the same character was not necessary. In *fact*, we find that he had his successors. Onesimus was one—Polycrates, according to Eusebius, was another; and he was the last of several of his kinsmen who had been Bishops of that Church. And thus the Church of Ephesus was governed by an Evangelist who had his successors. With this we are well satisfied, and shall not dispute with you about the title. But if he

Digitized by Google

did not govern as an Evangelist, then it was as a Presbyter, where there were many Presbyters. Will you allow this? If so, then there was a governing Presbyter, who had his successors. With this also we are well satisfied; for we care nothing about the title. But if not as a Presbyter, then it was as a Bishop. With this also we are satisfied. And thus you see, Sir, we are determined to be pleased, whatever you may call Timothy, provided you will allow him all the points of superiority which St. Paul gives him, and admit the testimony of the ancients that he had successors.

But it seems, after all, we have not gained the cause. You say, 'This gentleman still pleads, that directions about ordaining ministers, and regulating the affairs of the Church, were given to Timothy and Titus alone; that we hear of no others joined with them in those instructions; and that we have no right to suppose that there were such. This plea does not deserve an answer; but it shall have one. [Very condescending!] Suppose one of our Presbyteries or Synods were to send out a company of two or three missionaries; and for the sake of convenience were to convey their instructions in the form of a letter to the oldest and most prudent of the number; would this individual have reason to consider himself as a person of a superior order, on account of such a circumstance? Again: when we ordain a minister, the person who *presides* in the ordination generally recites to the newly admitted brother many passages from the Epistles to Timothy and Titus, seldom omitting, in particular, the injunction—*lay hands suddenly on no man.* But no minister ever considered this mode of address, as constituting him the *sole* ordainer in any case in which he should afterwards act. It would be as reasonable to say, that because the Apostle gave Timothy direction about public preaching, *therefore he* only was empowered to preach; or because he was instructed with respect to some parts of public prayer, *therefore he* only was allowed to pray. But there would be no end to such absurdities. It is really wonderful that gentlemen who appear to be serious, should lay so much stress on arguments, much better calculated to pour ridicule on the cause, than to afford it efficient aid.'

If you are serious in these observations, your prejudice has spread a thick veil over your understanding. Your honesty may be safe, but your discernment is gone *quoad hoc* [as to this particular.] There is not any parallel between the case you mention, and that of Timothy. Every line of the passage is palpably weak and inconclusive.

1. 'If one of our Presbyteries or Synods were to send out a company of two or three missionaries; and for the sake of convenience were to convey their instructions in the form of a letter to the oldest and most prudent of the number; would this individual have reason to consider himself as a person of a superior order?' No; he certainly would not; because it is previously *known* that he *is* not. The principles of his Church establish

Digitized by Google

parity among Presbyters; and, therefore, the other missionaries would never suppose that the Presbytery, or Synod, intended to give him a superiority over them. But the case of Timothy is quite different. We are seeking information from the Epistles directed to him, whether he *was* superior to the Presbyters of Ephesus *or not?* If it had been fully established previously to the writing of those Epistles, that either presbytery or episcopacy was the established order of the Church, then we should have a key to open the true meaning. *We* say, indeed, that episcopacy *was* established in the persons of the Apostles, by the commission given to them. But this *you* deny, and therefore we have recourse to the Epistles directed to Timothy and Titus. This single consideration shows, that there is no parallel between the case of the missionaries, and the case of Timothy.

But what sets the matter in a still more striking point of light is, that the injunctions in the Epistles to Timothy, are utterly inconsistent with the case of your company of missionaries, who are well known to be perfectly on a level. Take the following injunctions—*Rebuke not an Elder—Against an Elder receive not an accusation, but before two or three witnesses.* And the following to Titus—*A man that is an heretic, after the first and second admonition, reject.* Now suppose your old and prudent missionary were to receive such injunctions from a Presbytery, or Synod, and one of his fellow-missionaries were to become a heretic, could he excommunicate him? Or suppose one of them was to be charged by two or three witnesses with drunkenness, could your elderly missionary try him, and if found guilty, degrade him? You know he could not. He must be tried by the Presbytery under which he acts. But Timothy was the judge of all offenders in the Church of Ephesus. For that express purpose was he sent thither, and if this does not imply superiority, it is hard to say what does.

And as Timothy was thus evidently superior to the Presbyters of Ephesus in the article of judging offenders, he must of necessity be superior to them in the article of ordaining. He who holds the rod of discipline, must possess it for the purpose of preserving the faith in purity, and to keep out of the ministry of the Church all who are not qualified for sacred offices; otherwise, men of corrupt principles and immoral lives, might be introduced into the priesthood by a majority of factious Presbyters; and this would totally destroy, instead of promoting purity, decency, and order. Accordingly we find, that the precept respecting ordination, and the qualifications for the ministry, is directed to him alone; as is the precept respecting censure, judging offences, regulating the maintenance of the clergy, providing for widows, and directing the affairs of the whole Church. What then can be clearer than that Timothy was the Governor, or Bishop, of the Church of Ephesus?

But it seems, notwithstanding this superiority of power, we cannot fairly conclude, that Timothy was superior to Presbyters;

Digitized by Google

no more than we can that he had the exclusive power of preaching and praying, because he received directions on these points. How, Sir, is it possible that you do not see the difference? Do we not know from other parts of Scripture, and from the very purpose for which Elders were ordained, that they both preached and prayed? Nay, do we not know from these very Epistles, that Elders preached? Does not St. Paul say to Timothy—*Charge them* (the Presbyters) *that they teach no other doctrine.* But we do not know from any other part, and certainly not from these Epistles, that Presbyters had the power of ordaining, of rejecting heretics, and of censuring and excommunicating the guilty. Here again your parallel totally fails, and leaves you under the charge of weak and inconclusive reasoning. I conclude, therefore, in your words—'But there would be no end of such absurdities. It is really wonderful that a gentleman who appears to be serious should lay so much stress on arguments much better calculated to pour ridicule on his cause than to afford it efficient aid.'

But you are not done yet. 'Admitting,' you say, 'that Timothy and Titus each acted as *sole* ordainers at Ephesus and Crete—the probability is, that they did not; but supposing it proved that they *did*, it does not affect the question. Although Presbyterians, wishing to conform as perfectly as possible to scriptural example, require a *plurality* of ministers to be present, and to lay on their hands in ordination; yet I have no reason to suppose that any Presbyterian minister or Church would consider an ordination performed, in a case of necessity, by a single Presbyter, as null and void. Supposing it proved, therefore, that an inspired Apostle, in a new and unsettled state of the Church, sent forth Evangelists *singly* to preach, to ordain, and organize Churches, it would establish nothing, either way, material to the present controversy.'

This, Sir, is a totally different question from that which we are discussing. There can be no dispute that a *single* Presbyter, supposing presbytery to have been the government of the Church, or a single Bishop, supposing episcopacy to have been the government, might validly ordain: the question is, whether a Presbyter, where there was a number of Presbyters, as at Ephesus, could ordain *singly*, without being their superior? Whether a Presbyter in such circumstances could try an offending, could excommunicate an heretical Presbyter, without being his superior? It is evident to common sense that he could not. These exclusive acts would necessarily give him pre-eminence. All that you have said, therefore, about valid ordination by a single Presbyter, is foreign to the question. It is not calculated to prove the validity of Presbyterian ordination. You must first prove this, and then I shall have no dispute with you about the validity of an ordination by a single Presbyter. But when you take the point in dispute for granted, and then draw an inference

Digitized by Google

from it, which we would not deny, had you established the premise, your argument is good for nothing.

You conclude your observations on the cases of Timothy and Titus with increased confidence. You say, 'Every thing, therefore, Dr. B. has advanced to establish the prelatical character of Timothy and Titus is perfectly nugatory.' Every thing I have advanced is perfectly conclusive, if a power granted to Timothy to ordain Presbyters, to rebuke, censure, and excommunicate those Presbyters, to regulate the public worship, and all the spiritual affairs of the Church of Ephesus, be conclusive; and if these things be not conclusive in favour of episcopacy, there is not a Bishop on the face of the earth. All antiquity were ignorant, and all mankind at the present day are ignorant, in what the office of a Bishop consists.

And as to what you say about an unorganized Church at Ephesus, it is mere conceit; there not being a shadow to justify such a notion. That Church was completely organized upon your own principles. It had a numerous laity, a number of Presbyters and Deacons, and if you are right, Lay Elders also. Now if this be not an organized Church on Presbyterian principles, I would be glad to know what is?

To the clear and decisive proofs from Scripture of Timothy's prelatical character, I have added the testimony of a number of the fathers of the fourth century; Jerome, that 'man of learning and research,' being amongst them. I have given also the testimony of the whole Council of Laodicea, which enumerates twenty-seven Bishops from Timothy to their day. I have quoted Eusebius, who mentions Polycrates, as Bishop of Ephesus, in the second century, and says that seven Bishops of his kindred preceded him. Now, supposing these Bishops to have presided but fifteen years on an average, reckoning back from 180, when Polycrates governed the Church of Ephesus, we ascend to the year 75; so that probably the first of his race was the immediate successor of Timothy. I have also shown from Ignatius, that when he was on his journey to Rome, to suffer martyrdom, Onesimus was Bishop of Ephesus. And if all these proofs will not convince you that Timothy was the first Bishop of Ephesus, it is in vain to think that any proofs will. Much less has satisfied you that there were Ruling Elders in the Church in the apostolic age. Two or three fathers of the fourth century, although their testimonies are nothing to the purpose, and even contradictions, speak clearly and decisively; while ten times their number, in a case where no interpretation is wanting, are set aside as nugatory. Dean Swift has given a solution of this difficulty. "That was excellently observed, say I, when I read a passage in an author where his opinion agrees with mine. When we differ, there I pronounce him mistaken!"[a]

The prelatical character of Timothy has, I think, been so fully established, that it is needless to say one word more upon

a *Thoughts on Various Subjects.*

Digitized by Google

the subject. It is also needless to say any thing on the case of Titus; the reasonings and proofs being pretty similar in both instances. All the fathers who speak of the latter, with one voice pronounce him to have been the first Bishop of Crete. And it is sufficiently evident from the Scripture, that he had the same authority committed to him that was put into the hands of Timothy. There is not the least appearance of an equality of power between them, and their Presbyters. If this be not the meaning of the Epistles directed to them, then they are utterly unintelligible; and all the *ancients* were in a gross error concerning them. If this will not go to the point of unsettling the canon of Scripture, I am at a loss to say what will. An uninterrupted train of evidence is applicable to both cases.

I will now conclude this part of the debate, nearly in the words of Bishop Bilson. Speaking of a single Bishop presiding over a plurality of Presbyters, and a plurality of congregations in every city, he says, "This is a certain rule to distinguish between Bishops aud Presbyters—the Presbyters were many in every Church; Bishops were always singular; that is, one in a city, and no more, except another intruded, (which the Church of CHRIST counted a *schism*, and would never communicate with any such; or else an helper were given in respect of extreme and feeble age.) And this singularity of one pastor descended from the Apostles and their scholars, in all the famous Churches of the world, by a perpetual chain of succession, and doth to this day continue. Of this there is so perfect a record in all the stories and fathers of the Church, that it may inevitably be proved, if any Christian persons or Churches deserve to be credited.

I should now dismiss the scriptural instance of Timothy's prelatical character, were it not that I find in the *Christian's Magazine* some observations which are made with much confidence, and with a very triumphant air. After producing the two texts in question, Dr. Mason observes, 'From these texts one thing is clear, viz. that both Paul and the Presbytery imposed hands on Timothy. But several questions have been started about the rest. Who constituted the Presbytery? Why were hands imposed on Timothy? Was this his consecration to the evangelical ministry? If so, what share had the Apostle in the transaction, and what the Presbytery?'[t] Now, Sir, to be as short as possible, I will admit for the sake of argument that your sense of the word *Presbytery* is perfectly correct, and that the Elders had as much to do in Timothy's ordination as St. Paul; then it follows, upon your and Dr. Mason's principles, that lay Elders were concerned in the ordination. The words are express, *with the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery;* and a Presbytery is maintained both by your Church and his, to be composed of both lay and clerical Elders. There is no

t Vol. II. No. 2. p. 187.

Digitized by Google

possibility of escape from this conclusion. A true presbyterian ordination then, on your own principles, requires the imposition of both lay and clerical hands; but you take care, in practice, to keep the lay Elders out of sight. Never will you suffer them to lay on their hands with yours; and yet you say, 'we wish to conform as nearly as possible to Scripture examples.' What palpable inconsistency!

Nor will either you or Dr. Mason, for shame, have recourse to the distinction between δια and μετα. You certainly will not say, that lay Elders laid on their hands merely to express approbation; for then your own observations will stare you in the face. You are therefore fairly and inevitably reduced to the necessity of confessing that all your ordinations are unscriptural. This is merely *argumentum ad hominem;* and therefore does not affect Churches (the Independents for instance) which do not maintain the apostolic institution of lay Elders. But against you and Dr. Mason it is perfectly conclusive.

Yet the Doctor goes on to observe on the words, *with the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery*—"A plain reader would certainly say, that Timothy was *presbyterially* ordained: as he could not well imagine that a Presbyterian himself would have chosen to word the account differently." Then the Doctor's argument stands thus—St. Paul asserts that Timothy was ordained *with the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery*, which consisted of lay and clerical Elders. But in our ordinations we do not admit the agency of lay Elder. Therefore, our ordinations are perfectly scriptural, and exactly conformable to the example which St. Paul has given us. I wish the Doctor joy of his logic.

Whatever then may be the meaning of the texts in question, it is very certain that you explain them in one way, and practise in another. Correct your inconsistency, and then, perhaps, you may have something to say for yourselves.

There has undoubtedly been much speculation on the words of St. Paul to Timothy. One thing is certain, that the Apostle (if it was an ordination) ordained Timothy—*by the laying on of my hands.* It is also certain that a Presbytery did concur in some way or other—*With the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery.* But the great difficulty is to determine what is meant by a *Presbytery.* I admit that it signifies a number of Elders; but what sort of Elders I want to know? Can we determine by the modern acceptation of the word 'Presbyter?' Certainly not. No man of sound judgment will admit such a rule of interpretation. Can we determine it by the Scripture? I apprehend not; for the word is used but once in the New Testament to signify an Ecclesiastical council. How then *are* we to determine it? The Apostles called themselves Elders. A plurality of Apostolic Elders might then have ordained Timothy; or if the word 'Presbytery' mean a plurality of mere Elders, the Apostle was at their head, and ordained Timothy—

Digitized by Google

By the imposition of my hands. For what end then did the Elders lay on their hands? Was it merely to express their approbation, or to convey at the same time with the Apostle, the ministerial function? If the former, we gain our point. If the latter, the Elders ordained an Evangelist, who, if you and Dr. Mason be right, was an extraordinary officer; and then inferiors ordained a superior, which is an absurdity. If to avoid this absurdity, you say, that Timothy was ordained to the Eldership, and not to the office of an Evangelist; then the passage must be translated, *neglect not the gift of the Eldership, which was given thee by the imposition of hands;* and in this case no hands were imposed but St. Paul's. So that here you have no warrant for Elders imposing their hands. This is the sense given to the passage by some of the ancients, and by several eminent moderns, among whom we find Calvin. You indeed tell us, that when his judgment became more mature, he corrected his error. And to prove this, you quote him saying—"Those who think the name (Presbytery) is collective, and is put for the College of Presbyters, in my judgment think right;" but you take care not to add the words which immediately follow—"Tametsi, omnibus expensis, diversum sensum non male quadrare fateor, ut sit nomen officii." "Although, all things considered, I confess a different sense agrees well (with the words) that it should be a name of office." So that Calvin, with mature judgment, thought either sense good. I have not given the latter passage from his Commentary, because I think it of any consequence; but merely to show how unfairly you quote authors.

The construction however which Calvin approves, you think, destroys the cause of prelacy; for according to this sense, Timothy was ordained to the office of a Presbyter, and not to that of a Bishop. But no such consequence follows. To be ordained to the presbyterate, is to be ordained to the priesthood, and this comprehends the higher and lower orders of Priests; that is, the office of both Bishop and Presbyter; for both are Priests. In this way, our claim for Timothy's prelatical character is easily supported; while yours, for his character as an Evangelist, cannot be supported at all; it being impossible for inferiors to convey superior powers; an Evangelist, in your opinion, being a superior officer in the Church of CHRIST.

But notwithstanding the great names, both ancient and modern, that have adopted this interpretation, and which would effectually deprive you of even a shadow in all the New Testament, for the right of Presbyters to ordain; yet, I candidly confess, that it does not appear to me so easy and natural as our vulgar translation. To this I adhere (supposing the passages to relate to ordination, of which I have strong doubts.) The meaning of the word *Presbytery* then is the only thing to be determined, and this is no easy matter. Your idea of it, that it was composed of lay and clerical members, can never be admitted; for

Digitized by Google

then laymen must have concurred in the ordination, not of a mere Presbyter, but, on your principle, of a still higher officer, an Evangelist; which is absurd, and altogether inconsistent with the practice of your own Church. *You* have therefore nothing to do with the texts in question; you are utterly precluded by the notion you entertain of a Presbytery, and consequently they are left entirely in our hands. But, I confess that it is not an easy matter to determine, whether the word signifies a number of Presbyters, with an Apostle at their head, or a plurality of Apostles, who were concerned in the ordination. Some prefer the one interpretation, and some the other. If the latter be preferred, mere Presbyters are out of the question. If the former, the Presbyters laid on their hands to add to the solemnity, and to express approbation; otherwise they ordained, on your hypothesis, an officer superior to themselves, which common sense rejects.

But against the notion of the Presbytery laying on their hands merely to express approbation, Dr. Mason vehemently contends. Well, let it be that the notion is not correct, but that the Elders had as much to do in the business as St. Paul. Then I ask, in the words of the Doctor, "What ordination did Timothy receive? Was he ordained a Presbyter," or an Evangelist? "If the former, his character as an" Evangelist, "in so far as it depends upon his ordination, is swept away; and we have not a single instance of the consecration of an" Evangelist "in all the New Testament;" and, consequently, he and you have no right to make the office of an Evangelist a distinct office in the Church. "If the latter," an Evangelist, "how came Presbyters to impose hands upon the head of an" Evangelist, who, according to him, was a superior officer? Thus you see his mode of reasoning against prelacy completely destroys his and your notion of the superior character of an Evangelist, if it has that effect on prelacy.

Again: If the Presbytery consisted of clerical and lay Elders, did lay Elders impose hands to make Timothy a Presbyter, or merely to express approbation? You cannot say the latter on your own principles; the former therefore must be your choice. Then laymen conferred an authority which they themselves did not possess, which is impossible. Or if they did possess it, then they were not laymen, but Presbyters. So that you and the Doctor must either give up your lay Elders, or admit that they laid on hands merely to express the approbation of the Church, whose representatives you tell us they are. That you will not give them up, I am fully satisfied. Then they had either an equal share with St. Paul in ordaining Timothy, or they imposed hands merely to express approbation. But neither of these you will allow; then where is Timothy's commission, if St. Paul *alone* did not ordain him? Where is the example of ordination by Presbyters, which, the Doctor tells us, is all that the Presbyterians desire?

Digitized by Google

It is now, I think, inevitable, that you and Dr. Mason must either admit the distinction between δια and μετα, or you must allow of a *clerico-laico* ordination, which involves gross absurdity.

Notwithstanding this is the alternative to which the Doctor is driven, yet he labours very hard to prove that the usual distinction between the prepositions is not correct. He says, "The fact is, that this preposition (δια) never signifies *the cause* of a thing, whatever the Lexicons say. It expresses the idea of *transition* or *transmission*, and has no English word to correspond with it so well as the preposition *through*. Whether it is accompanied with the notion of *a cause* or not, must be determined by the phrase where it occurred."

After this *ex cathedra* decision, it will not do to quote Lexicons and grammars, however favourable they may all be to our side of the question. Let them then lie on their shelves, and let us have recourse to original writers.

"The fact is, that this preposition never signifies the cause of a thing."

I open my Greek Testament, and find these words: Παντα δι αυτου εγενετο—*all things were made by him.* Was not the *Eternal Word*, the *cause*, the *Creator* of all things?

Again: *Paul an Apostle of* JESUS CHRIST, BY *the will of* GOD—(δια.) Was not GOD's will the cause of Paul's appointment to the apostolate? *He was in the world, and the world was made* BY *him* (δι' αυτ.) *By whom we have received grace and apostleship* (δια.) CHRIST was the efficient cause.

Rom. i. 5. *Paul, an Apostle* (*not of men, neither* BY *man, but* BY JESUS CHRIST (δια.) Not man, but JESUS CHRIST was the *efficient cause* of the Apostle's commission. Gal. i. 1. GOD *is faithful,* BY *whom we were called unto the fellowship of his Son* JESUS CHRIST *our* LORD (δια.) GOD was the *efficient cause.* 1 Cor. i. 9. A hundred such instances might be produced. The Doctor then is not perfectly correct when he says, δια never signifies the cause of a thing. He is, however, correct when he says, this preposition "expresses the idea of *transition* or *transmission.*" With a genitive case, it very frequently has that meaning.

But all this serves no other purpose than to show that Dr. M. is not quite so correct as he thinks he is. It has no effect on the argument; for he acknowledges that to translate δια by the word *through* will answer our purpose very well, provided the preposition μετα excludes the Presbyters from conveying authority by the imposition of their hands. Thus he speaks—"But in spoiling the Layman's criticism, we acknowledge, that we have not overthrown his argument. For *if* the imposition of Paul's hands was the medium *through* which, to the exclusion of the Presbytery, he *alone* conveyed the ministerial commission to Timothy; and *if* this act of his formed a precedent for all subsequent ordinations, the Layman has won, and we own Timothy to have been episcopally ordained."

Digitized by Google

It seems then that we lose nothing by our translation of the preposition δια, and if we can but make out that μετα signifies approbation in the passage quoted, we shall win the cause.

Now this I take to be an unfair requisition. After the proofs we have given from a long line of fathers, for three or four centuries, that Bishops were a superior order to Presbyters, and that, consequently, they were the ordaining officers; and after the proofs given from the Epistles to Timothy of his superiority over the Presbyters, backed by Dr. M.'s own acknowledgment, it is rather hard that we should be required to rest the whole system of ecclesiastical polity on the vague and doubtful meaning of a Greek preposition. The preposition, it is agreed on both sides, signifies *concurrence, joining with, association.* But the question is, for what purpose? Was it to express approbation? Or to ordain? This can never be determined merely by the sense of the preposition. Nor will the word *Presbytery* determine who were the component members. If Apostles, or apostolical men, then Timothy was episcopally ordained. If it was composed of mere Presbyters, then he was ordained not only a Presbyter, but also an Evangelist, with powers superior to the Presbyters of Ephesus; which is impossible, as on this supposition, inferiors ordained a superior. And still further, laymen concurred in the ordination. I see no possible way for you to extricate yourselves from this absurdity, but by supposing with us that Timothy was ordained by St. Paul; and that the Presbytery, of whomsoever composed, laid on their hands for no other purpose than to express approbation. This supposition is perfectly consistent with the whole tenor of the Epistles to Timothy, and with the sentiments and practice of the primitive Church; but your hypothesis is utterly inconsistent with both.

When I consider that not one allowed instance can be produced in all antiquity of mere Presbyters ordaining, it strikes me with astonishment, that men can be so unreasonable as to found their cause on a single text, in the meaning of which they themselves cannot agree. Some Presbyterians make the Presbytery to consist of clerical and lay Elders; some of clerical only: some, that St. Paul acted at the ordination of Timothy merely as an Elder; others, that he acted as an extraordinary officer. When you tell us what you would be at, and take such unequivocal ground, that we shall know where to find you, we shall then direct our arguments against a precise position, and be no longer under the necessity of following you in all your doublings and windings.

Enough has, I think, been said on this subject. About sixty pages have been filled, in this and my first work, with arguments and proofs in favour of Timothy's episcopal superiority over the Presbyters of Ephesus; and every thing material that you and Dr. M. have said, has been shown to involve you in difficulties inextricable. Timothy, if I do not deceive myself, has been fairly seated in the episcopal chair of Ephesus.

Digitized by Google

The next point which it is necessary for me to review, is the Epistles to the seven Churches of the Lesser Asia. On this head you have made but few observations; relying on Dr. Mason's 'luminous and able Review of the *Episcopal Essays* in the *Christian Magazine*.' To the Doctor's light, then, let us turn our eyes. But this shall be the subject of my next letter.

LETTER XI.

REV. SIR:

THE principle on which Dr. Mason proceeds is that the *Stars* and *Angels* are not to be considered *individually*, but that each *Star* and *Angel* is a symbol for the ministry of each of the seven Churches. That *Stars* are symbolically expressive of ministers, I readily grant; and I grant further, that when the words are used without restriction, we have no right to infer superior and inferior grades of ministers. The question then simply is, whether there are any conditions in the text, which warrant us to say, that there was a superior minister in each of the seven Churches? The Doctor thinks there are none; and endeavours to prove it by several considerations.

Before I notice what he has said, it may be well to observe, that there were numerous congregations of Christians in the several cities named in the text. We know from the Scriptures, that in Ephesus there were thousands of converts, and a body of Presbyters; and you say, there were lay Elders also. Consequently, if by the Angel of the Church of Ephesus is meant the whole Presbytery, as you and Dr. Mason represent the matter, the words of the text must agree with the office of a lay Elder; but as that office relates solely to discipline, the symbol *Star* and the term *Angel*, cannot possibly correspond with the *lay*, as well as with the *clerical* part of the Presbytery; consequently the Doctor's principle falls to the ground.

Let us now examine whether this is really the case.

1. With respect to the Church of Ephesus. Chap. ii. 1. *Unto the Angel of the Church of Ephesus write.* 2. *I know thy works, and thy labour, and thy patience, and how thou canst not bear them which are evil: and thou hast tried them which say they are Apostles and are not, and hast found them liars:* 3. *And hast borne, and hast patience, and for my name's sake hast laboured, and hast not fainted.* 4. *Nevertheless I have somewhat against thee, because thou hast left thy first love.* 5. *Remember therefore from whence thou art fallen, and repent, and do the first works; or else I will come unto thee quickly, and will remove thy candlestick out of his place, except*

Digitized by Google

thou repent. 6. *But this thou hast, that thou hatest the deeds of the Nicolaitanes, which I also hate.*

The propriety of a symbol depends altogether upon analogy. A star which sheds material light, is a very proper symbol of a minister who diffuses intellectual light. But the lay Elders, who do not preach the word of life, diffuse no intellectual light; and as they are an essential part of the Presbytery, the *Star* cannot possibly be the symbol of that collective body.

Again: The *Angel*, according to the Doctor, represents the Presbytery of the Church. But the word, as every one knows, signifies a *messenger*. Now, the lay Presbyters deliver no *message* from the LORD OF HOSTS; and as there can be no Presbytery without them, consequently the *Angel* cannot represent the Presbytery.

'But do not the *star* and the *Angel* represent the *clerical* part of the Presbytery?' They do, if the Scripture says so; but the text says no such thing; therefore it is mere assumption.

Further: A *Star* in the sacred writings, is never used for the symbol of a plurality of ministers. The Doctor himself produces no such instance. He says, 'JESUS CHRIST is a Star; the twelve Apostles are stars—and so are the Apostate Clergy, figured by the third part of the stars, which the dragon cast down with his tail to the earth.' This is very correct; but who does not see that *stars* being the symbols of ministers, and *a star* being the symbol of ministers, are very different? No instance that I know of can be produced from the Scriptures, of a *single star* being the symbol of a plurality of ministers. The symbol would not be correct; a *constellation* would be the proper representative.

The Doctor might therefore have saved himself the trouble of quoting More, and Fulk, and Mede, and Stillingfleet. They all speak of *stars* being proper symbols of ministers; but not one of them says that, *a star* is used as a symbol of a plurality of ministers.

But supposing it to be the case, that the Stars do not represent the lay Elders, who do not preach the word; and that a single star is never used for a plurality of ministers; yet, on the other hand, how can a single star represent a single Minister, when he is not the *only* source of light in a Church? It will not be maintained, Dr. M. supposes, 'that the Bishop alone did *all* the preaching, gave *all* the instruction, and set *all* the example: i. e. emitted *all* the light on account of which Ministers are called *Stars*. The other clergy had some share in these useful functions. They too *preached the word:* they too *taught from house to house:* they too *let their light shine before others.* Now, one Star being appropriated to one Church, as one candle is to one candlestick; it follows from the nature of the comparison, that as one candle is the full *complement* of light for one candlestick; so one Star is the full complement of light for one Church. But the light which shone in these Churches did not

Digitized by Google

emanate from any individual: it emanated from a number of individuals; from the *collective body* of the ministers of religion. Therefore, the Star which expresses the whole light in one of these Churches, is a symbol, not of a single minister, but of her ministry collectively.'

Here it is evident, that the Doctor excludes the lay Elders from the Presbytery, and takes only that part of it which suits his purpose—the preaching Presbyters. The former, he is sensible, cannot be represented by a Star, because they diffuse no light, and, consequently, the symbol would be improper. It follows, then, from his own representation, that the Presbytery is out of the question.

2. To whom then was each of the Epistles addressed? The Doctor must answer, because the Scripture says so, to *the Angel* of the Church; who, according to him, represented the collective body of *Angels*, or preaching Presbyters. Then THE *Angel* must have had some distinction; for if he had none, the definitive article *the* could not possibly be used with propriety, as its very nature is to *point out*, or *distinguish* one of a kind. Who then was this distinguished person? He must be either the Moderator of the Presbytery, or a Prelate. The latter will not be granted us; he must, therefore, be the former. This is the opinion of Beza, Dr. Campbell, and a number of other Presbyterians. But he cannot be the Moderator of the Presbytery; for he is styled *the Angel of the Church;* and a Moderator, *as such*, has not the least relation to the Church. The consequence then is irresistible—that he was *the* Prelate, *the* President, or *the* Bishop of the Church; to which, in this character, he bore the most intimate relation.

Nor will the reproofs and commendations be applicable to this Moderator, who to-day *is*, and to-morrow *is not*. Nay, if he were even Moderator for life, they are not applicable to him; for a man can never be blamed for the bad conduct of the Presbytery, over whom he has no control; every thing being carried by a majority of votes. Nor,

Lastly, can the *Angel* represent the Moderator; because an *Angel* is a *messenger* from GOD; but a Moderator, *as such*, is no messsnger—*as such*, he is not the servant of GOD; he is merely the servant of the Presbytery, created and annihilated by their breath. For these reasons, it is impossible that the Moderator can be meant by the Angel. And as we have demonstrated that the Presbytery cannot be meant, Dr. M. himself being the judge, it inevitably follows, that *the Angel* is *the Bishop* of the Church.

I now come to the Doctor's *argumentum palmarium*—his triumphant argument. The amount of it is this. The Bishop alone cannot be signified by *the Star;* for he alone does not emit all the light that is in any particular Church. The Presbyters also emit light; therefore the *Star* represents the whole body of the clergy. This is undoubtedly very specious, and well calculated to impose upon the generality of readers.

Digitized by Google

To this plausible argument, I answer—

1. The *Star* and the *Angel* represent the same thing. This cannot be denied. Now I have proved to a demonstration, that *the Angel* cannot mean the whole body of the clergy. Therefore, the *Star* cannot be the *symbol of a collective ministry.*

2. I have proved that *the Angel* cannot represent the Moderator of a Presbytery; because the relation of the one is totally different from that of the other; and because the reproofs and commendations cannot possibly be applied to the Moderator. Therefore, the *Star* is not the *symbol of the Moderator.*

3. I have observed, that a *Star* is never used in Scripture to signify a plurality of ministers; and that Dr. Mason himself does not produce any instance. Therefore, the presumption is, that it does not mean so in the present case.

4. I have observed that very eminent Presbyterian divines, Blondel, Beza, and Campbell, disclaim the idea of *a Star* representing a plurality of ministers. This indeed is no proof; but it shows that men, as quicksighted as Dr. M. and as zealous for their system, could not see any force in his argument.

If then *the Star* and *the Angel* signify the same thing, as no one will deny; and as *the Angel*, and, consequently, *the Star*, cannot signify a plurality of ministers; yet it may be thought incumbent on me to show, that *a Star* can be a proper symbol of an individual, when he is not the only dispenser of light in a Church.

Now, whether I can do this or not, is very immaterial. If *the Angel* and *the Star* signify the same thing, and the *Angel* does not represent a plurality of ministers, it is evident, that the *Star* does not. The conclusion then must be, that they both represent an individual who presides over a Church, and has control over its ministers.

But I conceive there is no difficulty in showing, that *a Star* may be a proper symbol of an individual, even when he is not the sole dispenser of light in the Church, but has a number of luminaries under him.

1. Symbols, emblems, and metaphors, are founded on resemblance. There must be one capital point in which the analogy holds good; otherwise the figure is improper. But it is not necessary, that the sign and the thing signified should agree in all points. To deny this, would destroy all the symbolical language of Scripture. A *star* then is a proper symbol of the superior officer of the Christian Church; and it is not necessary, to give correctness to the symbol, that all the inferior officers should be represented by it. The Bishop is the source of authority to the Presbyters to dispense the word of life; he, therefore, with propriety, is represented by the *star*. Our SAVIOUR is called *a Star, a Morning Star;* because he is the source of light to his Church: but at the same time, there are many inferior luminaries, without whose exertions the light of the Gospel could not, in an ordinary way, be diffused. The Apostles are

Digitized by Google

symbolically termed *stars*; but never in their collective capacity *a Star*; and, at the same time, Presbyters diffused the light of the Gospel throughout the world.

If we turn our eyes from sacred to profane history, we also find the same principle adopted. Emblems correspond with *principals*, and *inferiors* are not considered. In Greece and Rome, while monarchy prevailed, a *single rod* was the symbol of kingly power; although the kings were far from possessing *all* the power of their respective states. The inferior ministers of power were not contemplated by the symbol; the superior minister, as comprehending the inferior ministers, was the only object represented.

This symbol of power was adopted in consequence of a principle then prevalent, that the chief officer was the representative of the Deity. Accordingly we find, that the chief priest of Apollo, when he came to the Greeks to ransom his daughter, had a scepter in his hand, and a crown upon his head, which is called στεμμα θεοιο, the crown of the god. But at the same time, the god had his inferior priests; yet the symbol was never applied to them.

This was the case also under the kingly government of Rome: the symbol had respect only to the *chief*. But when the regal power was abolished, and the republic took its place, the symbol was altered, and instead of a *single rod*, a *bundle of rods* was used; to signify that the power of the magistrates emanated from the people, who were all deemed peers in empire. This is evident from a line in Virgil—"Non populi fasces, non purpura regum." [Not the rods of the people, not the purple of kings.] Georg. 2.[u]

In the same marked character of symbolical language, the Chief Priest of the Christian Church was represented by a *star*, and the inferior Priests made no part of the thing signified. But when a number is the object of the emblem, *stars* are invariably the representative.

Thus it is evident, that Dr. Mason has mistaken the symbolical language of Scripture, and that he has displayed nothing but fancy.

But still the Doctor maintains, that *the Angel* represents the whole body of the ministers; and if so, then the *Star* does likewise. And to prove that Potter and Cyprian are not correct when they say, that *the Angel* of the Church never represents its ministry throughout the whole book of Revelations, he quotes the following passage—*I saw another* ANGEL *fly in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting Gospel to preach to them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people.*" (Rev. xiv. 6.)

'Heaven,' says the Doctor, 'in this book, is the ascertained symbol of the Christian Church, from which issue forth the

u See JONES' *Figurative Language*, p. 323.

Digitized by Google

ministers of grace to the nations. As the Gospel is preached only by *men*, this *angel* who has it to preach *to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people*, must be the symbol of a human ministry. And as it is perfectly evident that no single man can thus preach it, but that there must be a *great company* of preachers to carry it to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people, *the Angel* mentioned in the text is, and of necessity must be, the *symbol* of that *great company*.'

Now, whatever may be the meaning of the passage just quoted, it is very easy to make it appear, that Dr. Mason is totally wrong in the application of it. Cyprian says,[v] "They," the Angels, "are constantly mentioned in the singular number"—which, says the Doctor, 'is not true.' Now let the reader judge for himself, whether it is true or not. *Unto the Angel of the Church of Ephesus—Unto the Angel of the Church in Smyrna—To the Angel of the Church in Pergamos—Unto the Angel of the Church in Thyatira*—and just so of the other three Churches. If this is not constantly mentioning the Angels in the singular number, there is no singular number. 'But if it were true,' says the Doctor, 'the question still is, whether the symbolical term in the singular must necessary signify only a single person?' What symbolical term? Is the word *Angel*, that is, *one who delivers a message*, symbolical? No more than the title *Bishop*, or *Overseer*—no more than the word Presbyter, or Deacon. The *stars* are the symbols, and the Angels are represented by them, and there are just as many *stars* as *angels*, seven of each. A Bishop or Presbyter is not *a star* literally, but figuratively. But a Bishop or Presbyter is literally an *Angel* or *Messenger* from God to his fellow creatures. When therefore a Messenger or Angel is addressed in the singular, and when this is done in seven distinct cases, who, that regards the propriety of language, would not suppose that they are so many persons individually considered?

It being then evident from the address to the seven Angels, that they are to be individually considered, it follows from the commendation and threatenings applied to them severally, that they were the chief ministers in their respective Churches. It has also been shown, that the *Angel of the Church* does not mean its *Presbytery*, however constituted; and that it must, from the very nature of the article *the*, be restrained to an individual of some distinction. This individual, it has been proved, cannot be the *Moderator* of the Presbytery; for he has no control over it, and has no relation whatever to the Church. It therefore irresistibly follows, that he is *the Prelate* who is strictly related to the whole Church, and to every part of it.

But why, it may be asked, may not the *Angel* of the Church signify its ministry; when the Angel who flies through the

---

v *Essays on Episcopacy.*

Digitized by Google

heavens preaching the everlasting Gospel to the *nations*, means, and must mean, its collective ministry? I answer—

Supposing the interpretation to be of necessity correct, the case of the seven Angels requiring a directly contrary interpretation, from the circumstances that have been mentioned—no parallel can be instituted between them. The one is proper under its peculiar circumstances, the other under *its*: both may be proper, when the characters are different. The language is figurative, and therefore does not imply a real fact. It may mean to represent a spiritual ministry, propagating the religion of the Gospel throughout the world. But the addresses to the Angels are of a different character. They declare facts in plain language. They bestow commendations, or threaten punishments in terms of simplicity. An individual is praised—an individual is threatened. This implies power, and the alternative of choice. If the ministry of a Church was designed, a majority would give character to the whole, which would frequently be unjust. The officer who governs therefore is blamed or commended; and this officer, it has been fully proved, cannot be Moderator of a Presbytery; he must then be the Prelate or Bishop of the Church.

Accordingly we find, that Blondel, the great champion of the Presbyterian cause, acknowledges that the Angels of the seven Churches were so many individuals, to whom, as their *Exarchs* or *Governors*, the actions of the Church, whether glorious or infamous, were imputed."[w] His Exarchs, however, he makes no more than standing Presidents of the Presbytery, under the control of a majority of votes; which is so repugnant to every consideration of reason and justice, that it is hard to conceive how so learned a man could have adopted the idea. Beza, Campbell, and a number of other Presbyterians, consider the Angels as the Moderators of the Presbyteries; but this is worse than Blondel's notion; for their Moderators are changeable; *in* the chair to-day, and *out* to-morrow. This makes the notion ridiculous. Pray, Sir, agree among yourselves, and then you may, with more decency, contradict us and all antiquity.

Dr. M. however, thinks he has gained his point. 'Assuming it now as proved,' says he, 'that the term *Angel* is applied in this book to a *collective body*, or a number of men joined in a common commission, we demand the reason of its being restricted to an individual in the Epistles to the Churches of Asia. Signifying *a messenger*, it is in itself as applicable to any preacher of the Gospel as to a diocesan Bishop.' Very true. But *a* messenger, and *the* messenger, where there are many, are very different. The former signifies any messenger of that number; but the latter signifies a particular messenger; and, consequently, a messenger of distinction. The article alone then settles the point.

---

w Iis (scilicet Presbyteriorum præpositis) ceu Ἐξάρχοις communi gregis, &c. *Apol. Pref.* p. 6.

Digitized by Google

But as the Bishop is not the sole preacher and instructer of the people, the Presbyters having an equal right with him in this respect, the Doctor asks, 'By what rule of propriety should *he* be characterized by symbols which are foreign from his appropriate functions? By symbols which describe exactly the functions of those ministers whom, we are taught, they do *not* represent?'

The reason is obvious enough. Although a Bishop and Presbyter, in respect of preaching and instructing, are on a footing; yet as the latter derives his authority to preach from the former, and exercises it under his control, the Bishop receives from this circumstance a character of superiority, which justifies the restriction of the term *the Angel*, and renders the symbol of a *star* applicable to him, κατ' ἐξοχην, by way of eminence.

Still our difficulties are not at an end. 'Any plain reader,' says the Doctor, 'will observe, on a slight inspection of these Epistles, that they address the *Angel* of a particular Church in the singular or plural number indifferently. Thus to the *Angel* of the Church in Smyrna, the Redeemer says, *I know thy works, and tribulation and poverty, but thou art rich—Fear nothing of those things which thou shalt suffer. Behold the devil shall cast some of you into prison, that ye may be tried; and ye shall have tribulation ten days: be thou faithful unto the death; and I will give thee a crown of life.*

'We ask any dispassionate man, whether all this is not addressed to the Angel in Smyrna? *Thou*, says the text, *thou*, the *Angel*, shalt suffer. Thus saith the text, *the devil shall cast into prison some of* YOU—you who are signified by the Angel. However, *be* THOU *faithful unto the death;* i. e. although thou shouldst die for being faithful; *and I will give thee*, (whom? certainly the persecuted,) *I will give thee a crown of life.*' This the Doctor thinks is full proof that the Angel of the Church means its ministry.

I do not deny that *amongst* the things written to the Angels, some instructions are mingled, in which the whole Church are concerned. But the Doctor should consider, that addresses begun with *one*, are sometimes diverted to *many*. Thus, in the fourth chapter to the Philippians, the Apostle begins, *Therefore, my brethren, dearly beloved and longed for, my joy and crown, so stand fast in the* LORD, *my dearly beloved. And I entreat thee also, true yoke fellow, help those women which laboured with me in the Gospel.* Again, in the second Epistle of Timothy, St. Paul says, *The* LORD JESUS CHRIST *be with* THY *spirit. Grace be with* YOU.

Now, in the words of the Doctor, 'I ask any dispassionate man, whether this Epistle is not addressed to *Timothy?—with* THY *spirit—Grace be with* YOU, i. e, (according to the Doctor's mode of reasoning) with *you* who are signified by *Timothy*. Again, I ask, whether the Apostle does not address the Philippians in a body?—*My brethren, dearly beloved?* And whether

Digitized by Google

he does not immediately divert his discourse from *many* to *one?* *I entreat* THEE *also, true yoke fellow*, i. e. *thee* who art signified by the Philippians. A new and curious mode of interpreting!

The fact is, that these sudden transitions are frequent in the Scriptures, and also in the Greek and Latin classics, particularly in the Greek. The writers thought that they contributed to strength, and often to beauty.

But further: The Doctor has run himself into a difficulty here, to which he does not seem to have adverted. If *thou* and *you* respect the same object, as *you* indubitably relates to the whole Church, both clergy and laity, it follows that the *Angel* means both clergy and laity; and, consequently, the laity are the messengers of GOD as well as the clergy; and that is in effect saying, there are no laity, but all are clergymen.

Now to show some gross sophisms into which our opponent has run.

Potter and Cyprian say, "When what is said relates to the *people*, the style is altered, the plural number is then used."

'This gloss,' says the Doctor, 'is contrary, 1. To the plain and natural construction of the Prophet's words; which, using sometimes the singular, and sometimes the plural number when speaking of the Angel, leads us to a simple and easy solution, by supposing that he employs that term in a *collective* sense of the *whole ministry* of the Church.'

But the plural number in the text refers to the whole Church, both clergy and laity. This is evident from the words—*The devil shall cast some of* YOU *into prison, that* YE *may be tried; and* YE *shall have tribulation ten days.* Now, unless the Doctor can prove that none of the laity were cast into prison, he fails most egregiously. He assumes the fact, and then accommodates himself with the wished for conclusion. This is the *petitio principii*, or mere begging the question.

He goes on—'The Epistle is written to *the Angel* in Smyrna. Angel, say they, *always* signifies a *single* person, and *never* a number of men; and yet they say, that of this very Epistle to the Angel, part is addressed directly to the *people*, who are a society or number of men.'

What they say is very true, and perfectly consistent. The Epistle is addressed to *the Angel;* and yet through this medium the whole Church is occasionally addressed. The *Angel* in the singular—the Church in the plural. Here the Doctor mistakes the question. Our position is, the Angel signifies a *single* person, and that when he is addressed in the singular number, the people are not intended; but when the plural is used, the people are intended. But the Doctor's position, to make us inconsistent, must be that we say—In an Epistle addressed to the Angel, who represents a number, the Angel never represents a number. But there is not the slightest inconsistency in saying, that in an Epistle addressed to an individual, the community of which he is the head, may occasionally be addressed.

Digitized by Google

This is the sophism called *ignoratio elenchi;* or *a mistake of the question.*

4. The Doctor observes with respect to the titles *Star* and *Angel*, that they are perfectly synonymous. 'Now,' says he, 'both these symbols depict *official* character;' [*Angel* is no symbol;] 'therefore,' says he, 'under the term *Angel*, the ministry and the people cannot be distinctly addressed.' Very true —this is just our doctrine. With whom is the Doctor contending?

But the Doctor here very arbitrarily rejects the people, and holds fast the ministry. The text, however, is equally applicable to both. His restriction is, therefore, inadmissible.

5. He observes, 'If the *Angel* is the collective body of the ministers upon whom the persecution was to fall, then the exhortations, *Fear none of those things which thou shalt suffer— Be thou faithful unto the death;* and the promise, *I will give thee a crown of life*, are in harmony with the premonition that the *devil should cast some of them into prison.* The anticipation of evil is softened by the assurance of support.'

All this is assumption: it has not yet been proved that the Angel is the collective body of the ministers; on the contrary, it has been fully proved that *he* is not. The sorrow and the consolation go one way—to the Bishop, the ministry, and the people, support is promised. To the Bishop, *Fear none of those things which thou shalt suffer. Be thou faithful unto the death, and I will give thee a crown of life.* To the ministers and people the same reward must necessarily follow the same virtues. If fidelity in the Bishop deserved reward, it must necessarily deserve it in the ministers and people. It is not, therefore, repeated.

To conclude, in the words of the Doctor, *mutatis mutandis*, [the needful changes made,] 'We do not feel conscious of any arrogance in supposing, that after the reader, who is solicitous to know the truth, shall carefully have examined and compared the reasonings now submitted to him, and allowed them their due force on his mind, he will coincide with us in the opinion, that the *angels* and *stars* in the context before us, do *not* signify a *collective minister*, but *single persons* of distinction and eminence in the Church.'

I shall now inquire, whether the primitive writers afford us any proofs of Bishops being in *fact* settled in the seven Churches, when St. John wrote the Revelations. This I take to be the great advantage we have over you, that we can establish our sense of those passages of Scripture which are in dispute between us, by an appeal to the fathers. For this mode of settlement you have no great affection, but generally underrate it as much as you can with any show of decency; and this too at the expense of putting it out of your power to establish the canon of Scripture, and the change of the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week.

Digitized by Google

1. We are assured by Irenæus, who was Polycarp's disciple, that he (Polycarp) was ordained Bishop of Smyrna by the Apostle John.[x] Eusebius also bears testimony to this fact.[y]

2. There can be no doubt that at the time the Revelations were written, there was a Bishop presiding over the Church of Ephesus. It has already been observed, that in the second century, Polycrates was Bishop of Ephesus, and that seven of his own race had preceded him; so that in all probability, one of them was the immediate successor of Timothy. And we learn from Ignatius, that when he wrote his Epistles, which was about twelve years after St. John's return from Patmos, Onesimus was Bishop of Ephesus. He was therefore either the first or second Bishop from Timothy; and, it has been observed, that the council of Chalcedon reckoned twenty-seven Bishops from him down to their time. This is surely sufficient evidence for Ephesus.

3. When Ignatius wrote his Epistle to the Philadelphians, they had a Bishop, to whom he recommends obedience.

4. Not long after St. John's time, Sagaris was Bishop of Laodicea. Polycrates mentions him in his Epistle to Victor, as having suffered martyrdom in past times; "that is," says Potter, "when Servius Paulus was Proconsul of Asia, as we learn from Melito's tract about Easter, who was himself Bishop of Sardis in the reign of Marcus Aurelius. So that very near the time we are speaking of, we find a Bishop in Laodicea; and not long after this another in Sardis."[z]

Since then there is evidence sufficient to convince an impartial mind, that there were Bishops presiding over the four Churches we have named, we reasonably infer that there were also over the other three. And when you add to this, that Irenæus, Clemens of Alexandria, Eusebius, Ambrose, Jerome, Austin, and several others, accounted the seven Angels so many diocesan Bishops, surely there is enough to establish our sense of the Epistles addressed to the Churches of the Lesser Asia. Could you produce any of the fathers asserting that the *Angels* do not mean the Bishops of those Churches, but the whole ministry, we should then think that we had something serious to contend with. But till you do produce something of this kind, we shall certainly think that we have sufficient reason to conclude, that the seven *Angels* represent the seven Bishops of the Proconsular Asia.

After Dr. Mason's specious defence of the notion, that the Angels of the seven Churches stand for the ministry of those Churches, the few observations you have made are not of sufficient consequence to deserve notice. Your notion of the Angel being the *Moderator*, if a ministry be not designated, has been shown to be utterly irreconcileable with the text; and your illustration of the notion, from the city of Edinburgh being but one

---

x IREN. Lib. iii. c. 3.

y *Eccles. Hist.* Lib. iii. c. 36.

z POTTER'S *Church Government*, p. 148.

Digitized by Google

parish, and Trinity Church having several chapels, which are all under one Rector, have been proved to be not at all in point.

You have, however, one very unwarrantable assertion. You say, that I appear to be sensible of the insufficiency of Scripture evidence upon this point; and therefore have recourse to the fathers. This is not the first instance of your asserting what you had no right to assert. There is not a syllable in my ninth Letter, which indicates the smallest doubt in my mind of the sufficiency of the Scripture evidence; but I always confirm our sense of that evidence, by showing that it agrees with the testimonies of the primitive writers, who, living near the times of the Apostles, must be much better judges of the facts than we can possibly be. When a man wants to know the form of Church government in the second century, if he is in possession of common sense, he will have recourse to the records of that century. And if he finds it uniformly either Episcopal or Presbyterian, he will say, unless this uniformity proceeded from general consent, expressed by a general council, it must have had an apostolic source. But finding that no such council met in that century, and that all the writers agree in respect to the point of government, he would think that man predestined not to believe that rejects such evidence. Nay, he would think that he must, in order to be consistent, give up the evidence of testimony altogether. For who can have recourse to it, after saying that the writers of the first three or four centuries did not know what was the constitution of the primitive Church? or, what amounts to the same thing, that it is doubtful how far these fathers are credible witnesses—how far their assertion is founded on authentic records, and not on conjecture? When a man talks at this rate, it answers very little purpose to reason with him.

'But,' you say, 'supposing that their assertion is founded on authentic records, it still remains to be ascertained in *what sense* they use the word Bishop.'

What a strange observation! When Episcopalians use the word Bishop, it still remains to be ascertained in what sense they use it! When they use it, who upon earth would suppose they mean it in a Presbyterian sense? If diocesan episcopacy prevailed in the second century, would not of course all the writers of that age talk like Episcopalians? Were I, in the course of a sermon, to use the word *Bishop*, would any body, knowing to what Church I belong, suppose I meant a *congregational* Bishop? But were I, in the sermon, to declare in what the powers of a Bishop consisted, could there be any possibility of entertaining a doubt? Were I to say with Cyprian, that he is at the head of the priesthood—that it is his province to ordain—that he is the *superior* of the clergy—that he has the chief power of the keys—that it belongs to him to confirm, to excommunicate, and to restore; would any human being suppose that I was speaking of a congregational Bishop? Were I to say with Ignatius, that Presbyters must be subject to their Bishop;

Digitized by Google

that they have no right to baptize and administer the eucharist without his authority; that he is the vicegerent of GOD and of CHRIST; and that Presbyters hold but a secondary rank, as the Apostles did while CHRIST was on earth, administering the affairs of his Church; could it enter into the mind of any man that I was speaking of congregational Bishops? The supposition is ridiculous. There is therefore nothing necessary but to determine what was the government of the Church in any particular age, and then it follows, that the writers of that age are to be understood according to the current notion and practice.

There is but one thing more that I shall notice, and that is, your assertion that I misrepresent Blondel. Pray, Sir, for what purpose did I quote him? Was it not simply to prove, that the Angels of the seven Churches represented the *exarchs* or *chief governors* of those Churches? And does he not say so? His words are, "The acts of the Church, whether they were glorious or infamous, were imputed to their exarchs or chief governors." And is not this saying, that each of those Churches had a chief governor, and that the Angel represented him? I did not quote Blondel to prove that he maintained a difference of order. I knew his scheme too well for that. He most indubitably supposes, that there was in every city, whatever may have been the number of the Churches, a Presbytery, with a President or Moderator for life; and that when he died, the oldest Presbyter succeeded to the chair. This officer he calls the *exarch* or *chief governor*, who had of course certain prerogatives. This he says it is necessary to maintain, otherwise the difficulties are insuperable, But this plan does not mend the matter. I could, were it necessary, demonstrate that the oldest Presbyter did not succeed to the Presidency. But this is not for my purpose. His scheme I have nothing to do with. I have quoted him in reference to the *seven Angels*, and not to prove that he maintained *diocesan episcopacy*. He did not believe in *parity*, unless a person can hold a presidency for life, and yet be on a footing of equality with those over whom he presides. Had you attended to what I have said, and compared it with your own extract, you would not have made the following improper observations—'I make no comment on Dr. B.'s perversion of these plain declarations. If he fell into it *ignorantly*, he is to be excused; if *wilfully*, no reader will be at a loss for appropriate reflections.'

I have now finished all I have to say on the present point, and shall proceed to notice what you affirm with respect to St. James, the first Bishop of Jerusalem.

On this point it is needless to spend much time. I shall but just observe, that as there were numerous congregations at Jerusalem, and numerous Presbyters, upon your own principles, they must have had a Moderator. Now St. James must have been that Moderator; not only from his being distinguished from

Digitized by Google

the Presbyters on all occasions, but from his being an Apostle, whether of the twelve, or not, is immaterial. He is expressly called an Apostle by St. Paul; and all acknowledge the Apostles held a jurisdiction over the inferior orders. Now, as he constantly resided in Jerusalem, he must, from the circumstance of his being an Apostle, have presided over that Church. This consideration proves, that our interpretation of the texts which strongly intimate this superiority, is correct. And when you add to this the unanimous testimony of the ancients that he was the first Bishop of Jerusalem, and that he is always placed at the head of the catalogues, what more satisfactory testimony can you have? You would certainly receive such testimony for any other matter of fact; and if you would not, you must reject many things that have not stronger support. Can you seriously think, that you know more about the government of the Church of Jerusalem than the ancients? Even Jerome will decide the matter for you, if you will allow him. He says expressly, that St. James governed the Church of Jerusalem. But you have your usual evasion here. 'Admitting the fact,' you say, 'to what does it amount? Why, simply, that James was one of the clergy, perhaps the *senior* clergyman of the Church of Jerusalem, and probably the most conspicuous and eminent of them all.' To what will not hypothesis lead men! How weak is reason when opposed to prepossession! Jerome says, 'immediately after the passion of our Lord, James was constituted Bishop of Jerusalem"—that is, was constituted the *senior* clergyman! Clemens of Alexandria is quoted by Eusebius as saying, that, "after the assumption of CHRIST, Peter, James, and John, did not contend for the honour of presiding over the Church of Jeruralem, but, with the rest of the Apostles, chose James the Just to be Bishop of that Church;" —that is, to be the *senior* clergyman! It was also received (as I have observed) as an undoubted fact by Hippolytus—by Cyril of Jerusalem, (one of James' successors) and another Cyril of Scythopolis—by Epiphanius and Chrysostom—by Augustine and Fulgentius—by Nicephorus and Photius—by Oecumenius and Nilus. And it was also mentioned as a matter universally acknowledged by the sixth general council[a]—that is, all these writers mean, that James was appointed the *senior* clergyman! Indeed, Sir, this is below, far below a man of sense.

'But,' you say, 'let us sift this matter a little. Hegesippus is quoted by Eusebius as relating that James, the brother of our LORD, undertook, together with the Apostles, the government of the Church of Jerusalem. This is the earliest writer that is brought to testify directly on the subject; and he declares that James presided over the Church in Jerusalem *in conjunction with the other Apostles.* He says, indeed, a little before, that the Bishopric of Jerusalem was given to James by the Apostles;

a Letter XII. p. 340. [Vol. I. p. 168.]

but when we come to compare the two passages, and to interpret the one by the other, the whole testimony of this writer will be found perfectly equivocal.' Now, Sir, this testimony is so far from being perfectly equivocal, that it is perfectly unequivocal. Every one, with the New Testament in his hand, must see, that for some time the Church of Jerusalem was governed *jointly* by the Apostles; but after their dispersion, James remained and governed that Church. There he lived, and there he died; and after his death Simeon succeeded to the presidency, as all antiquity asserts. Here is a succession, not of equality with the other Presbyters (for that is nonsense,) but to the pre-eminence which James the Apostle had over them. This was a presidency over numerous Presbyters and numerous congregations, which, indeed, he would necessarily have by virtue of his apostolic character, but which he had also by the appointment of the other Apostles. Nor is Hegesippus, who lived about the middle of the second century, the earliest writer on this subject. Ignatius, who had lived nearly his whole life in the apostolic age, says enough to convince any unprejudiced mind, that James presided at Jerusalem. He says that Stephen was the Deacon of James. How of James? Upon your plan, he must have been the Deacon of the Presbytery. For if James was no more than the *senior* minister, he had no more relation to Stephen than the other ministers. Such are the difficulties in which you involve yourself.

Now comes again your usual contemptible subterfuge. 'Some of the later fathers also, following Hegesippus, speak of James as the Bishop of Jerusalem; but do they tell us in what *sense* they employ this title? That the Apostles and primitive Christians sometimes employed it in a sense different from that which is adopted by our Episcopal brethren, is confessed on all hands. And that these early writers, when they speak of James as Bishop of Jerusalem, mean to say that he was a Prelate, in the modern and perverted sense of the term, is what we confidently call in question, and what Dr. B. with all his brethren to aid him, cannot prove. I know that the Professor loses all patience at intimations of this kind; but it is by no means the first time that a man has been provoked by a demand of *proof*, when he had nothing but *assertion* to produce.'

Well, Sir, this is a flourish equal to any that graces your book. Of declamation, I am sensible you are never much in want; but here you soar above yourself. This stroke convinces me that you are not altogether unacquainted with human nature. You know, I perceive, that whoever declaims with agility, will be, in the judgment of the common run of readers, more than a match for any other man, or any *seven men that can render a reason.* Who that aims at truth, would not avail himself of such a powerful weapon?

So, you think it doubtful, what sort of Bishop the fathers meant, whether a congregational or a diocesan? James, they

Digitized by Google

say, was appointed Bishop of Jerusalem; that is, to an equality with fifty other Bishops! James governed the Church of Jerusalem; that is, had an equal share of the government, with many others! James was the first Bishop; that is, had no authority over the Presbyters! James too had his successors; that is, they succeeded to nothing; or they succeeded equally with the other Elders! 'Oh no! James was perhaps the Moderator.' Well then, James the Moderator, who sat in the chair a day or a month, or perhaps a twelvemonth, was succeeded about thirty years after by Simeon, another temporary Moderator. He had also his successors for ages; and there is strict propriety in calling a temporary Moderator, Bishop of a city, and Governor of the Church in that city, although it contained a multiplicity of Presbyters and congregations, over whom he had no authority! 'Oh no! James was Moderator or President for life; he might therefore have his successors.' James was President of the Presbytery for life, over whom, however, he had no authority; he being under the absolute control of a plurality of votes! James, as President for life, governed the Church of Jerusalem, to which, as President, he had no relation at all! Mercy on us! To what will men not some men submit rather than acknowledge an error!

'But the most wonderful part of the story,' you say, 'is, that Dr. B. produces Calvin as a witness in support of the Episcopal dignity of James. On this point he speaks in the following terms: "So evident is it, that James was Bishop of Jerusalem, that even Calvin thinks it highly probable that he was governor of that Church. 'When, says Calvin, the question is concerning dignity, it is wonderful James should be preferred before Peter. Perhaps it was because he was *Prefect* of the Church of Jerusalem.' (*In Gal.* ii. 19.) Calvin did not choose to speak plainer; for that would have been in contravention to his ecclesiastical regimen."

Well, Sir, it seems you admit that I have quoted Calvin correctly. He thought it probable that James was *prefect* of the Church of Jerusalem. What is the meaning of this title? A *prefect* is one *qui rei alicui præficitur*—who has the charge, the government, the oversight of any thing—a chief officer, a governor, a superintendent. Now, does this mean a temporary Moderator? He holds no government over the Presbytery, nor over the Church. Nor would he hold any, were he *prefect* for life; the duration making no difference in the degree of authority. What then can Calvin possibly mean, but that James was the Governor or Bishop of Jerusalem? I have not asserted, that Calvin had the same idea of a Bishop that we have. I have not asserted, that he thought him an officer of a superior order to a Presbyter, or that he was the sole ordainer; but I have quoted him expressly for the purpose of showing that he had no idea of *parity* in the Church. It is impossible that James could have been the Prefect or President of the Church of Jerusalem, and

Digitized by Google

be on a footing of equality with the Presbyters; and if Calvin at any time talks otherwise, he flatly contradicts himself. That he did not consider the Church, in the times of the Apostles, as existing under a parity of officers, is evident from the following passages. Speaking of Jerome's comment on Isaiah vi. he observes, that Jerome reckoned five orders in the Church—Bishops, Priests, Deacons, Believers, and Catechumens; "therefore," says Calvin, "to whom the office of teaching was enjoined, these they named Priests. In every city they chose out of their number one, to whom they especially gave the title of Bishop; that *dissensions should not grow of equality.* Yet the Bishop was not so above the rest in honour and dignity, that he had *dominion* over his fellows. But what office the *Consul* had in the *Senate*, to propose matters, to ask opinions, to go before the others with counselling, admonishing, and exhorting, to govern the whole matter with his authority, and to put in execution what is decreed by common counsel, the same office had the Bishop in the assembly of the Priests." From this it is evident, that Calvin did not believe that there existed in the Primitive Church a parity of ministers; but that there was in every Church, at least a *Primus inter pares*—[a chief among equals.] The Primus, Prefect, or President of the Church of Jerusalem, was, he says, James, the brother of our LORD; but how a President or Prefect can be on a footing of equality with those over whom he presides, is far beyond my comprehension.

Nor does the passage which you quote from Calvin militate in the least against the opinion which I ascribe to him. You say, 'the moment I cast my eye on this quotation from Calvin, I took for granted that something had been kept back, which, if produced, would turn the tables on the Professor. And this accordingly proves to be the case. The passage, as it really stands in Calvin, is as follows. "The Apostle speaks of their (James, Cephas, and John) *seeming to be pillars*, not by way of contempt, but he repeats a common sentiment. Because from this it follows, that what they did, ought not to be lightly rejected. When the question is concerning dignity, it is wonderful that James should be preferred to Peter. Perhaps this was done because he was *President* of the Church of Jerusalem. With respect to the word *pillar*, we know, that in the very nature of things, those who excel others in talents, in prudence, or in other endowments, must also be superior in authority. In the Church of GOD it is a fact, that in proportion as any one is strong in grace, in the same proportion is honour due to him. It is ingratitude, nay, it is impiety, not to do homage to the SPIRIT OF GOD wherever he appears in his gifts. And further, as the people of a Church cannot do without a pastor, so each particular assembly of pastors stand in need of some one to be *moderator*. But let it be always understood, that he who is *first of all* should be as a servant, according to Matt. xxiii. 11."

On this passage, I would observe, first, that there is not one

Digitized by Google

expression in it which does not perfectly accord with the notion of a *Primus inter pares.* Calvin's *Moderator* is undoubtedly a *moderator* for life, possessed of the powers which he himself enumerates in the passage I have quoted; and which necessarily imply a superiority of dignity. Nor did James' superiority arise from pre-eminent talents, or pre-eminent grace; but from the election of the other Apostles, according to the writers who mention the case. Nor, lastly, do talents, or prudence, or other endowments, *confer* authority. They may *lead* to it; but it is very far from being true, that in the nature of things they give it. Authority comes either from superior force, which enables a man to usurp it; or from the election of those who have a right to bestow it. Talents, or other high endowments, generally give *influence;* but not *authority.* They are different ideas: the latter, in a greater or less degree, implies the former; but influence does not imply, in the nature of things, authority. Calvin, in my humble opinion, is very far from being happy in his observations on this point. But this is not material; the passage, in no respect, contravenes what I have ascribed to him.

It is then beyond all dispute, that I am perfectly correct in my quotation from Calvin, and you are very unfortunate in not being able to show the contrary. I am also correct in my observation, that he did not choose to speak plainer, lest he should contravene his system. It is possible, however, that I have not expressed myself so clearly as to preclude misconception. I take Calvin's scheme of Church government to be founded on *parity of order*, but not on *parity of dignity.* The former he explicitly asserts; but the latter he leaves you to gather from certain expressions and comparisons. To me he appears reluctant to admit imparity in any respect; but matter of fact stood so much in his way, that he could not possibly avoid it. He knew that antiquity bears testimony to James' being the first Bishop of Jerusalem. This he could not deny. He, therefore, calls him the *Exarch* or *Governor* of that Church; conveying to his reader no clear idea what he meant to comprehend under the term. Certainly, it implies imparity in some degree; but Calvin leaves us to conjecture in how great a degree. And from what this want of perspicuity arose, I cannot see; unless it be, that on the one hand, he did not choose to contradict the testimonies of the fathers; and, on the other, to say what might seem to bear hard on his own system. He was in a strait between parity of *order*, and imparity of *dignity;* and in such a case, it is not an easy matter so to speak as to preserve perfect consistency between these two ideas.

Whatever ground there may be for this supposition, certain it is, that I have quoted Calvin with perfect correctness, and I have given no meaning to his words which does not belong to them. You ought, therefore, if not out of respect to me, yet assuredly to yourself, to have forborne the following questions: 'Where is the testimony from Calvin now? And I will add, where are

Digitized by Google

Dr. Bowden's blushes?' Dr. B., bowing with profound reverence to Dr. Miller, assures him that he does not blush for himself, but for his polite opponent; whose embarrassment in this controversy he has frequently commiserated, but whose respectability he will always acknowledge.

But this intemperate sally, it seems, is not enough. You rise in confidence, misrepresentation, and bitterness. You put me in mind, Sir, of a sarcastic canon of a criticism which I have met with. "Consider," says the author, "whom you write for. If for scholars, and people of the best sense, use a little salt, not much; but if for the common sort of people, you may spare your salt, and use gall, which comes easier and cheaper, in the room of it."

To proceed—You observe, 'This is not the only instance in which Dr. B. entirely perverts the language of Calvin, and represents him as delivering opinions *directly opposite* to those he really does deliver.' You then say, 'I cannot forbear to notice a single specimen, so gross and remarkable, that I could scarcely credit the testimony of my own senses, when I found it advanced by both my opponents, not only with confidence, but with even sarcastic exultation, as a great concession of the reformer of Geneva in their favour.'

Now, Sir, with respect to the passage to which you allude, I deny that there is in my page, so much as a shadow of 'sarcastic and reproachful exultation.' I deny that there is a single word, which, even upon the rack, will afford you a tittle to bear you out in your assertion; and I defy you to point out any thing of the kind. You are really, Sir, so much in the habit of ascribing to me things to which I have not the least title, that I know not very well how to assign a reason for it, unless it be, that you are a man who knows his business, and what best suits the taste and spirit of party readers. Let us now see how the matter will turn out.

You inform us that, 'In his Commentary on Titus i. 5. Calvin speaks largely of the mission of that Evangelist to the Churches of Crete. Dr. Bowden and Mr. How wish to persuade their readers, that, in these remarks, he fairly gives up the point that Titus was a diocesan Bishop, or Prelate. Accordingly they both represent him as saying—'Hence we learn that there was not any equality among the ministers of the Church, but that one was placed over the rest in authority and counsel.' On this pretended quotation from Calvin, Mr. How observes, 'Here the divine institution of superior and inferior grades of ministers, is asserted in unqualified terms.' p. 63. Dr. Bowden quotes the passage from Calvin exactly in the same manner, and makes precisely the same use of it with Mr. How.'

As Mr. How is perfectly competent to defend himself against any attack which you, or any body else may make upon him, I leave him to take care of himself. He is not a weak adversary, as you will find when his answer appears. As to my own par-

Digitized by Google

ticular, I have to say, that you go on in your usual strain of misrepresentation. I have not quoted Calvin to show that he maintained the divine right of episcopacy in our sense of the word; but merely to prove that he was not an advocate for parity. This I have already put beyond a doubt, and the quotation in question sufficiently evinces it. But it seems I have not translated the passage correctly. Supposing that I have not, what will you gain by it? You translate it 'There was not then such an equality among the ministers of the Church, but that some one *might preside* in authority and counsel.' I translate it, 'At that time there was no equality among the ministers of the Church, but some one in authority and counsel had the pre-eminence.' Now, where is the difference as to the sense? 'Some one might preside,' you say. 'Some one had the pre-eminence,' I say. Calvin endeavours to remove the objection, that there is seemingly too much power given to Titus. No, he says, there was not at that time such an equality, but that some one might have the pre-eminence in authority and counsel. Is not this imparity in *dignity?* Imparity in *order* I have not intimated that he maintained. Your translation is rather more literal than mine; but mine gives Calvin's sentiment just as correctly yours. Surely one who is superior in authority and counsel, must hold a dignity of pre-eminence. Surely consular dignity, which Calvin ascribes to the Bishop, is a very considerable elevation; and that too during the Bishop's life. This is certainly prelacy in no small degree. And this prelacy he allows to have been in the Church in the time of St. Mark. He also several times allows St. Cyprian to have been a prelate, and that there were even Metropolitans in his time. And, besides, he heartily recommends the ecclesiastical government at that time, and says expressly; "That if the Church in his time would agree to such an episcopacy, no curses could be imagined, which he should not think those worthy of, who would not submit to it, with all reverence, and dutiful obedience." The same idea of imparity is maintained by Blondel and many other great Presbyterian writers. They had the conception of parity in the Church of CHRIST, under, or at any time after the Apostles. All they contend for is, parity of *order;* but imparity of *dignity* they freely concede; and Blondel expressly says, that the difficulties are insuperable if the concession be not made. Yet you are contending for perfect equality; and want to make your readers believe, that your opponents pervert Calvin's declarations; and that I in particular, am reduced to the necessity of admitting, that either I cannot translate a plain sentence of Latin, or that I intended to deceive; and you very civilly tell me to take my choice. In the name of common decency, how could you use such expressions? In the name of common sense how could you be so weak? But you are *a man*, and *humanum est errare*, [it is the lot of man to err,] and sometimes most egregiously.

I have to correct but one more particular, and that is the idea

Digitized by Google

which you mean to convey in the note at the foot of the page. Your long quotation from Calvin ends thus: "This (precedency in authority and counsel) was, however, nothing like the tyrannical and unscriptural prelacy which reigns in the Papacy. The plan of the Apostles was extremely different." On this you say, 'Here Calvin not only represents *prelacy* as a *tyrannical* and unscriptural system, but evidently considers it as a part of the corruptions of popery.' This is wonderful logic! Prelacy in the Church of Rome, is tyrannical and unscriptural; therefore it is so in the Church of England. Again: The prelacy which reigns in the papacy is tyrannical and unscriptural; therefore the prelacy which reigns in the Church of England, is a corruption of popery.

You have, Sir, so indissolubly connected popery and prelacy in your mind, that I believe the idea of the one never comes up without the idea of the other. Popery as old as prelacy, and the parent of it too! Prelacy, according to Calvin, existed in the time of Mark—in the time of the Apostles; therefore popery existed then! Cyprian is acknowledged by him to have been a prelate, and the government at that time is considered by him as a model for imitation. But that excellent government, according to you, was a corruption of popery. You certainly must have some knowledge on this subject, which no other mortal has; or you have no knowledge whatever. With respect to you, there is no medium. No one before you ever lisped that popery existed in the time of Cyprian. How then have you become acquainted with the fact? If you cannot produce a single testimony to the purpose, then it is evident that you know nothing about the matter. Calvin, of whom you have a high opinion, (and in some respects he deserves it) declares that the papal supremacy had no existence till the time of Phocas in the seventh century, who, he says, "granted to Boniface the third, that which Gregory never required, that Rome should be the head of all the churches."[b] This is the era of popery. There were indeed some corruptions in the Church of Rome before that time; so there were in other Churches; yet no one ever called these corruptions popery. Yet ages before that era, Calvin admits that there were diocesan Bishops, Metropolitans, and Patriarchs. He never gives a hint that prelacy sprung out of popery; for how could he, without running into the absurdity of placing the effect hundreds of years before the cause? It is your felicity to have made so glorious a discovery—a discovery equal to that of Epicurus' atoms dancing themselves into a splendid universe.

I shall now, Sir, close the Scripture evidence for episcopacy, by making a few observations on the commission given by our SAVIOUR to his Apostles.

After our SAVIOUR had commissioned the Apostles to preach

b *Institutes* Lib. VI. Sect. 17.

Digitized by Google

and baptize, he assures them that he will *be with them to the end of the world.* It is admitted on all hands, that this promise implies a continuation of the gospel ministry to the end of time, and that the commission empowered the Apostles to preach, to administer the sacraments, to govern the Church, and to ordain others to the same holy office. This is the whole sacerdotal power which the Apostles received, and which they received from the commission given them, and from that alone. And *with* this authority, CHRIST has promised to *be to the end of the world.* Now it is most certain, and I believe disputed by nobody, that the Apostles, in virtue of their commission, and on no other ground, did govern all orders of men in the Church —Presbyters, Deacons, and lay-believers. But the powers of government which the Apostles exercised, are, by virtue of CHRIST's promise, to be perpetual in the Church; consequently there must be an order of men of the same rank with the Apostles to the world's end, or CHRIST's promise has failed. Presbyters are not of that rank, because they were subject to the Apostles. It follows, then, that those individuals who presided over Presbyters, such as Timothy, Titus, the seven Angels, and others, are the true and proper successors of the Apostles, in the full extent of that power implied in the original commission. To those *single* successors, ecclesiastical usage has appropriated the title Bishop.

Perhaps it will be said, that, although the Apostles did exercise authority over Presbyters and all others, yet before their death, they left the whole power implied in the commission, in common with the Presbyters, who continued to exercise it in a collegiate way for one or two centuries; and consequently, the government of the Church by a Presbytery, in which all are equal, is the true apostolic mode. To this I answer,

First. As it is indisputable, that the power of governing Presbyters was given to all the Apostles collectively, and to each individually; and as it is indisputable, that each Apostle *did* exercise this governing power in all the Churches which he planted; nothing short of a full and clear evidence of a change from apostolic superiority to presbyterian parity, can be admitted. Now, where is that evidence to be found? Not in the commission—not in the practice of the Apostles by virtue of that commission—not in the Epistles of Timothy and Titus, which are decidedly anti-presbyterian—not in the circumstances of the Church of Jerusalem, where St. James presided, who from his apostolic character must have been the governor of that Church; and who, from the testimony of the ancients, was actually the governor of it—not from the Epistles of the seven Angels of the Churches in Asia Minor, in which there is nothing that looks like parity; and, lastly, not from the testimonies of the fathers, who all assert, that the Apostles conveyed to individual governors, their prelatical character.

Again: If the Apostles conveyed to Presbyters the whole

Digitized by Google

power of the commission which they received from CHRIST, and by which they exercised prelatical jurisdiction, then they changed the original constitution of the Church. But can it be supposed that after CHRIST had established prelacy, as is evident from the Apostles exercising it, they would presume to alter CHRIST's own institution; and when they knew too, that CHRIST had promised to be with that institution to the end of the world? This can never be admitted: but if it were, the consequence would be, that CHRIST had altered his mind, which would argue weakness. This no Christian will allow. I cannot see how it is possible to avoid these consequences. If the Apostles were prelates in consequence of their commission, as they undoubtedly were, prelacy was the original establishment, as CHRIST himself was the author of it; consequently it is of divine origin.

But it may be asked, Did not the Apostles exercise this superior jurisdiction by virtue of their extraordinary gifts? I answer, No; but by virtue of their commission. Their extraordinary gifts were the evidence that they had received a commission to instruct mankind, and to govern the Church. By these they confirmed also the truth of their doctrine. Extraordinary powers prove claims of the persons who are endowed with them; but in themselves, abstractly considered, they do not determine whether a man is an Apostle, a Presbyter, a Deacon, or a lay-believer. All these orders wrought miracles; all of them had extraordinary gifts of one kind or other. A miracle just proves what a man intends to prove by it. The Apostles wrought miracles, to prove the truth of Christianity; to prove they had a commission from CHRIST to reform the world; and that they had power to govern all orders in the Church. Stephen and Philip, who were but Deacons, wrought miracles, not to prove that they were Apostles, but to convince the Jews that the Christian religion was from GOD. Laymen wrought miracles, not to prove that they were Apostles, but to prove the truth of the Gospel. Those wonderful *signs*, CHRIST had promised *should follow them that believe;* for the purpose of convincing the world that his religion was from GOD.

If miracles, abstractly considered, were a mark of the Apostolic character, then all that had that mark were Apostles; and consequently, the number of the Apostles was very great; for the number of the believers who wrought miracles, and bore no office in the Church, was very great. But this would have confounded all orders in the Church. It is then evident, that miracles gave no distinction to the Apostles; but simply proved the claim they had to that superior authority which they exercised, and which they said they had received from CHRIST. To lay-believers, miracles were signs or proofs of the truth of their religion; but not that the workers of them were Apostles, or that they held any office in the Church. And to all, miracles were a proof of that thing for which the miracle was wrought.

Digitized by Google

It is then evident that the miraculous powers of the Apostles gave them no superiority in the Church of CHRIST. To assert the contrary, would involve the absurdity, that all who possessed extraordinary powers were also Apostles. The commission was the source of their prelatical character; and with that commission, thus involving prelacy, CHRIST promised to be to the end of the world.

From this view of the subject, it appears to me to be an unavoidable consequence, that prelacy was the government which CHRIST established in his Church; and from the whole tenor of Scripture, it appears to have been exercised by the Apostles, and to have been committed by them to *single* successors, who have carefully handed it down through a long series of Bishops to the present day.

I have now traced episcopacy up to its source, and to my mind, the evidence is irresistible. How it may appear to others, I cannot say; but thus much I *will* say, if any man will produce me stronger evidence for the canon of Scripture, and for the apostolic institution of the Christian Sabbath, I will acknowledge that I give greater weight to the evidence for episcopacy than I ought to give. And further, I will say, if any man will show me one Church under presbyterian regimen in the primitive ages, I will acknowledge episcopacy to be a mere human institution.

I will now make a few observations on your assertion, that the Christian Church was formed on the model of the Jewish Synagogue.

It should be particularly remembered, that in discussing this subject, there is but one point which needs to be brought into view, viz. whether the Christian ministry was formed after the ministry of the Synagogue. I have asserted in my twelfth Letter, that the probability lies against this supposition; and that the fact established by abundant evidence, both from the fathers and the Scripture, that a Bishop presided over numerous congregations, proves to a certainty that it *was not*. Against the probability that it *was*, I maintained that the Jewish Synagogue was not a Church by divine appointment. This is the opinion of several of the most learned men that have ever written upon the subject; and you yourself acknowledge, that it is altogether uncertain. Prideaux says, "that they (the Jews) had no Synagogues before the Babylonish captivity, is plain, not only from the silence which is of them in all the Scriptures of the Old Testament, but also from several passages therein, which evidently prove there could be none in those days. For as it is a common saying among the Jews, that where there is no book of the Law, there can be no Synagogue; so the reason of the thing proves it. For the main service of the Synagogue being the reading of the Law unto the people, where there was no book of the Law to be read, there certainly could be no Synagogue. But how rare the book of the Law was through all Judea before the Babylonish

Digitized by Google

captivity, many texts of Scripture tell us."[c] He then gives from the Scripture sufficient evidence of this. But you think that the time of erecting them is of no consequence; and this is certainly true, if it can be made out that they were erected by divine appointment, after the captivity. But of this there is no evidence. Ezra's being an inspired man, is no proof that he established them; but if he did, it is no proof that he was directed to do so; for inspired men did many things, merely on the ground of human expediency. David made several regulations with respect to the temple service, which no one pretends were of divine appointment. Nor does the expression in the 74th Psalm—*the Synagogue of* GOD, prove any thing to the purpose. The word synagogue means an assembly; and what those assemblies were, the learned are quite at a loss to determine. Some think they were the schools of the Prophets; and that is as likely as any thing else. Where there is such a total uncertainty, there can be no ground on which argument can be founded.

But what renders it certain that the Synagogue was not a Church of divine appointment, is, that it was totally destitute of mystical rites, or sacramental signs. There never was a Church of divine appointment without these. What if baptism was administered to Heathen converts? It was not done, so far as we know, by divine appointment. There was no way of admission into covenant with GOD but by circumcision. Baptism alone was not sufficient: that rite therefore did not make a man a member of the Synagogue: it was necessary that he should first be made a member of the Jewish Church by circumcision. Baptism was a mere traditionary practice, like many other *washings* among the Jews, but without a divine warrant; and consequently, was not a sacrament. But as the Church of GOD never was without some sacramental sign, or federal right, the Synagogue was not a Church of divine appointment.

But you tell your readers, that I am *daring* in speaking as I do, because I cannot determine 'when Synagogues were instituted, by *whom*, and from *what source* the suggestion or command to establish them came.' Now, Sir, this uncertainty is the very reason of my being so *daring*. When no mortal can say any thing about their origin, either as to time or authority, no mortal but yourself would draw a parallel between what we are sure *is*, and what we are sure *is not* a Church, from its having no federal rites, and no ministry by divine appointment. For in all fair reasoning, where there is not the least evidence, there is no ground to rest an assertion upon.

But you say, 'Granting that the Synagogue was a mere human institution; that it made no part of the Jewish Church properly so called; and that no Jew was under any obligation to attend on its service;—what does he gain by the concession? Nothing. It is so far from destroying my argument, that it does not affect

c *Connections*, Vol. II. p. 535.

Digitized by Google

or even touch it.' Now, to be short; your argument depends upon the following circumstances. 'Every particular Synagogue had three classes of officers, a *Bishop*, *Elders*, and *Deacons*;—the peculiar office of a *Bishop*, (or, as he was sometimes called, the *Angel*) of the Church, [Synagogue] was to *preside* in the public service, and *lead the devotions* of the people;—that the principal duty of the bench of *Elders*, was to assist in *ruling the Synagogue*, and administering its discipline; and that the *Deacons*, though sometimes called to the performance of other services, were particularly charged with collecting and distributing alms for the poor.' There were also in the Synagogue 'ordination by the imposition of hands—reading the sacred Scriptures, expounding them, and offering up public prayers.' Now, your conclusion is, that from a coincidence of *names*, *duties*, and other circumstances, the Christian Church was formed on the plan of the Jewish Synagogue; and, consequently, episcopacy is not *diocesan*, but *congregational*.

To all these particulars I have given distinct answers in my twelfth Letter; but you have taken good care, as usual, not to examine the force of them. I shall not transcribe what is there written, but request my readers to peruse that letter with attention. The following essential points of disparity, however, deserve to be noticed again. The Bishop of the Synagogue had *no presidency*, or moderatorship over the Elders; the Bishop of the Christian Church *had*, by the consent of all parties. The first had no divine commission, the last had: the one had no authority of any kind out of his own synagogue; the other had authority over numerous congregations. The one administered no sacraments; the other did. The one was the *messenger* or *angel* of GOD; the other the *messenger* or *angel* of *the people*. And yet, notwithstanding these essential points of difference, the one was the copy of the other, because they had the same name, and both of them preached and prayed! And even the title *overseer* might just as well have been taken from the Greek supervisors of cities, and the Roman *overseers* of districts, as from the minister of the Synagogue.

Again: There was also an essential difference between the Elders of the synagogue, and of the Christian Church. The latter preach and administer sacraments; the former did nothing of the kind. This entirely destroys the analogy; and besides, the title was in existence ages before Synagogues had a being. Your lay-Elders indeed bear some analogy to the Elders of the Synagogue; and as the latter had no divine warrant, so neither have the former, if we may reason from analogy. Deacons also, or those who were employed in inferior ministries, we find in the temple, the Synagogue, the temples of the Heathen, and in the Christian Church.

Now, what a strange thing it is, that a man should argue from trifling coincidences in religious institutions, and when there are essential points of difference, that the one was copied from the

Digitized by Google

other! No, Sir, it is highly improbable, that the ALMIGHTY would take for the pattern of his Church a human institution. It is much more probable, that the external economy of the Christian Church was conformed in all things material to the Jewish Church, as will appear from an enumeration of particulars. The congregation of Israel was divided into *twelve tribes*, under the twelve patriarchs; so is the Church of CHRIST founded on the *twelve* Apostles. Besides these, CHRIST appointed other *seventy* also; in correspondence with the *seventy* Elders, who assisted Moses in his ministry. Aaron was appointed a high priest, under whom were the priests, and subservient to both, the order of the Levites. There were then *three* orders in the Jewish Church; in the Christian *three* likewise, the Apostles, the Presbyters, and the Deacons; to the first of which succeeded the Bishops. There were in the Jewish Church, prayers, praises, benedictions, and federal rites; so there are in the Christian Church: preaching indeed was wanting in the temple service. The whole Jewish economy, according to St. Paul, was, in its main points, typical of the Christian dispensation. And surely, upon this principle, it would be a strange thing, if there was not a conformity between the ministries of the Christian and Jewish Churches; when both were founded on the same authority; but that the ministry of the Christian Church, which is divine, should be conformed to the ministry of the Synagogue, which is human.

But whatever may be thought of the analogy in either case, one thing I think an impartial mind will feel the force of—the abundant proof given, that diocesan episcopacy was the original institution. This is proof *from fact*, that the Christian ministry *was not* conformed to that of the Synagogue; and consequently destroys every thing that can be said in favour of the *supposition*.

I have now closed this part of the debate, and shall proceed in my next to what you have said with respect to the principles of the Reformers.

LETTER XII.

REV. SIR:

I SHALL now endeavour to show, that your observations on the opinions of the Reformers of the Church of England, are totally groundless.

You attempt to destroy the credit of Heylin and Collier. With the first I have no concern, as I have not quoted him to establish any point relating to the Reformers of our Church; why then you have named him, I cannot see. Thus much

Digitized by Google

however, I will say for him, that he had abundant reason to be much exasperated at *parity* men. He had seen the Church completely ruined; her clergy stripped of their subsistence, and reduced, with their families, to beggary. He had seen such scenes of injustice, cruelty, and villainy practised by those men, while, at the same time, they were making pretensions to a very superior degree of sanctity, that he must have been either more or less than a man, not to have conceived the utmost abhorrence of their principles. Parity and Calvinism he therefore detested; and this would naturally lead him to speak of them in terms too severe. But notwithstanding this, he was an excellent man; of pure morals, and real piety; nor do I know any writer that I would sooner depend upon for facts which came under his own observation. But as I have not produced a single testimony from him in respect to the present subject of debate, I need not say any thing more about him. Collier, indeed, I have quoted; but it seems he too is a partial writer, and therefore not to be depended upon. Well, Sir, this is making short work. You have only to depreciate the authority I adduce, and there is an end of the matter. But this is not all; you not only wish to sink my authorities, but to establish your own, as if they were perfectly impartial. If you can think Neal deserves that character, your prejudice must be very stubborn indeed. A volume might be filled with his gross and shameless misrepresentations. Read Maddox in answer to him, and if there be a possibility of dissipating your prejudice, that book will do it. Yet I do not say that I would reject what Neal says, merely because *he* says it. I would examine circumstances, and weigh probabilities, and then give him more or less credit for his assertion. Calamy I cannot say much about, as I know very little of him; but from what I see in Stillingfleet and Maurice, he also is far from being impartial. In short, in all controversial matters, writers on both sides must be closely watched; for it is almost impossible, when the mind is zealously attached to a particular system or party, to keep within the bounds of strict fact, and always to give a correct view of men's principles and actions.

But to waste no more time. You shall have full credit for what you quote from Calamy and Neal. Let it be that in the *Bishop's Book*, composed by Cranmer and others, it is expressly declared, that in the New Testament there is no mention made of any other Ecclesiastical orders 'than Deacons or Ministers, and Presbyters or Bishops.'

Now, my first observation is, that the book whence your quotation is taken, was written several years before the Reformation. Not a single article of importance but the *Pope's Supremacy*, was as yet altered. Cranmer and the other reformers were, at this time, just beginning to inquire into the doctrines and government of the Church. The public mind began to be agitated, and to keep it under some degree of control, the *Institution of a Christian Man* was composed, in which were maintained all

Digitized by Google

the doctrines of the Church of Rome, except the superiority of the Pope. Cranmer and his associates appear to have been tinctured at that time, with the distinction invented by the zealous advocates of the *Papal see.* This distinction is fully expressed in L'Enfant's *History of the Council of Constance.* "The historian, giving an abstract of Gerson's book concerning Ecclesiastical power, informs us, that Gerson observes there is some difference between the sentiments of the lawyers and divines concerning episcopacy. The lawyers call episcopacy *an order*, because it is above the priesthood. Though the divines thought that episcopacy is a hierarchical power above the priesthood, yet they do not say that it is an order, because it adds nothing to the power of the priest over the true body of JESUS CHRIST; therefore it is not a new *order*, but a new *power*. From this account, it appears, that before the Reformation, although it was the general opinion, that episcopacy is a hierarchical power above the priesthood, or a *new power* added to that of Presbyters, which power was known always to have been communicated by a new ordination; yet in the language of the divines, in contradistinction to that of the lawyers, it was not called a *distinct order*."[d] This distinction, Bishop Burnet says, "sprung out of the very dregs of popery!" And indeed it is so utterly frivolous, that it is not worth while to stop a moment to expose it. With this opinion, the reformers, before they had risen much above the level of popery, seem to have been in some degree, if not totally, infected. They therefore expressed themselves in the current phraseology, that there were but two orders; but at the same time meaning, as the generality of divines did, that episcopacy is a superior degree of the priesthood. With this we are perfectly satisfied; for a *new power*, and a *new ordination*, imply all that we contend for.

2. This mode of speaking is similar to that which obtained a long time under the Jewish dispensation. Throughout all the books of Moses, Aaron, the first High Priest, is never dignified with any higher character than that of Priest, nor was Eleazar his son, who succeeded him in the high priesthood, called by another name. But afterwards, the distinction of names obtained to express the distinction of officers; so that in the historical parts of the Old Testament, and in the Prophets, the High Priest is called the Chief Priest, and the inferior priests have their distinctive title. Now, would not a man expose himself to contempt, who would argue from this confusion of names, a sameness of office? Degrees in the office, there certainly were. Just so, before the Reformation, the popish divines thought that there were degrees in the priesthood, and not different orders. This distinction was invented to save as much as possible the dignity of the priesthood, to which was attached the high honour of converting bread into the *real body* of CHRIST,

d CHANDLER'S *Appeal Defended*, p. 80, 81.

Digitized by Google

3. It is a canon of criticism, observed by all judicious interpreters, that words and phrases must be taken in the current sense of the times. That I have given that sense correctly, is beyond contradiction. This then is the true key to the meaning of Cranmer and his brethren, when they speak of but two orders as mentioned in the Scripture—the order of the priesthood, and of the deaconship; the former including priests, the generality of whom possess equal powers; but over these is placed a superior priest by divine appointment, for the important purpose of preserving the unity of the Church, and preventing those dissensions and schisms which too often spring out of equality. This notion of the episcopal office was invented after transubstantiation became the established doctrine of the Church of Rome; and at the Reformation it was pretty general among the clergy. It is therefore evident, that nothing in favour of your side of the question, can be inferred from the quotation you have given from Neal and Calamy, when the opinion and language of the times are brought to view; but keeping them out of view as you do, (of which, however, a fair disputant would not be guilty) there seems to be something that casts a favourable look on parity of ministers.

What further evinces that this is a correct statement, is, the quotations that I am now able to give from the *Erudition of a Christian Man.* This book I had not when I first wrote; but I can assure you that it is at this moment under my eye. The *Erudition* was published, you know, six years after the *Institution*,[e] and still Cranmer and his associates were staunch papists in every article but the *Pope's supremacy;* so slow was the progress of their minds in rejecting the corrupt doctrines of the Church of Rome. Not even in the absurd doctrine of *transubstantiation*, had their minds undergone the least change. This is evident from the following words, "In this moste hygh sacrament of the aultare, the creatures which be taken to the use thereof, as bread and wine, do not remaine still in theyr owne substance, but by the virtue of CHRISTIS word in the consecration, be changed and turned to the very substance of the body and blood of our SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST."[f] It is then clear beyond all contradiction, that we are not yet to look for any thing final, either as to doctrine, or government, from the divines who composed the two books under consideration.

That the authors of these books did not maintain the doctrine of ministerial parity, is evident from their constantly distinguishing Bishops from Priests in the *Erudition.* "Thus: St. Paul did consecrate and order priestes and Bishops by the imposition of handes. And as the Apostles themselves in the beginning of the Churche, dyd order priestes and Bishops: so they

e The edition from which I quote was printed in the year 1543, "by Thomas Barthelet, printer to the King's Highness."

f *Sacrament of the Altar*, p. 2, where will be found more to the same purpose.

Digitized by Google

appointed and wylled the other Bishops after them to do the lyke, as St. Paul manifestely showeth in his epistle to Titus and Timothy."[g]

This passage clearly proves, that the reformers considered the office of a Bishop as superior to that of a Priest, in some respects. The expression is "Bishops *and* Priests," and not "Bishops *or* Priests." Again: When the authors say, the Apostles "appointed and wylled the other Bishops after them to do the lyke" —that is, ordain; they drop the word Priests, and say the power was committed to the *Bishops* who succeeded the Apostles; and for proof of this, they quote the Epistles to Timothy and Titus, which they understand precisely in the same sense that I have given to them; that is, as confining the giving of orders to Bishops, which is the principal distinction between them and Presbyters. If this be not talking like prelatists, I do not know what is.

This language, which necessarily distinguishes Bishops from Priests, is uniformly the language of the *Erudition;* nor do I find a single instance in which the expression, Bishops or Priests is used. This book, therefore, is decidedly opposed to the opinion which you ascribe to the reformers.

Now, who would expect that the only answer you are able to make to this clear and distinctive language is, 'Do not many Presbyterians speak the same language?—Does not every Presbyterian grant that there were many Presbyters in the Apostles' days, who had no pastoral charge, and who were, of course, no Bishops? Is Dr. B. unable to understand this? Or does he close his eyes against it?'

Dr. B. assures Dr. Miller, that though he is not always able to penetrate to the bottom of his meaning, yet on this occasion, his vision is so clear and distinct, as to perceive thoroughly, that the answer is perfectly ridiculous. Presbyterians call those Bishops who have a pastoral charge, and those Presbyters who have not; therefore Cranmer made the same distinction! Titus was sent to Crete, and Timothy to Ephesus, to ordain Presbyters; and though on the Presbyterian hypothesis, Presbyters and Bishops are the same officers, yet the Presbyters of Crete and Ephesus were not Bishops, because Timothy and Titus had the pastoral charge! St. Paul, who had *the care of all the Churches* which he planted, so long as he had that care, was a Bishop; but when he lived in his own hired house at Rome, and had devolved that care on others, he ceased to be a Bishop, and sunk into the Presbyter! Does not the absurdity of this strike you?

This notion, which you say Presbyterians entertain, that a man is a Bishop when he has a pastoral charge, and but a Presbyter when he has not, is, I think, quite new in ecclesiastical history. Will you be so good as to name any author of anti-

---

g *Sacrament of Orders*, p. 2.

Digitized by Google

quity, or any passage in the New Testament, which makes such a distinction? But if you could, it would be to no purpose; for still the question would be, whether the Bishop was congregational or diocesan, and in reference to the present state of the debate, whether Cranmer had any such notion. That he had not is most certain, if we may judge from the *Erudition*, or from any other of his writings. Priests, in his day, were generally attached to a congregation, but neither he nor any body else thought that they were on that account Bishops. Nor did he suppose, that the episcopal authority was founded on the circumstance of a Bishop's having a charge; but that the Bishop was invested with the episcopal character by his commission, and that had he the next moment been disabled from exercising his episcopal authority during his whole life, still he would continue a Bishop. It is the distinction of powers which makes a distinction between a Bishop and a Presbyter, and not the attachment of the former to a charge, and the want of a charge on the part of a Presbyter. This is so evident to common sense, that nothing but the strait to which you are reduced, could ever have suggested the distinction which you have asserted.

It is strange, Sir, that you should so far forget the radical principle of your own system as to make the distinction now in question. It is an essential principle of Presbyterianism, and which you yourself maintain, that Bishop and Presbyter are but two names for the same officer; consequently, whoever is a Presbyter, is also a Bishop. Were you not to maintain this position, your argument, bad as it is, from the community of names, would be entirely lost. If a Presbyter, when he is not attached to a congregation, is not a Bishop, then a Presbyter and Bishop are different things; and if they are the same officer, however circumstanced, then your distinction is perfectly ridiculous.

Suppose, Sir, a man were ordained a Presbyter by your Presbytery, for the purpose of converting the Heathen on this continent; would he be a Bishop in consequence of his commission, or not? If he would, then he would be a Bishop without a pastoral charge; for by this, I take it for granted, you mean the charge of professing Christians, which, by the supposition, is out of the question. If he would not be a Bishop, in virtue of his commission, then it seems, though a Presbyter by that commission, he is not a Bishop by it. How then does the same commission make him both a Bishop and a Presbyter?

Again: If a Presbyter be not a Bishop till he receive a call from a congregation, and take the charge of it, then he is a Bishop in virtue of a call, and not in virtue of a divine commission. Consequently, a Presbyterian Bishop is the mere creature of the people, and not a Bishop empowered to feed and govern a flock by authority from the great Head of the Church. If this, Sir, be the extent of your claim, as it certainly must be, if consistency be preserved, we shall not be disposed to think you can depress yourselves much lower.

Digitized by Google

You go on to say, 'I asserted, that about the year 1547, in an assembly of divines called by Edward VI., Archbishop Cranmer, in answer to a question respecting the office of Bishops and Presbyters, replied, 'Bishops and Priests were at one time, and were not two things, but one office in the beginning of CHRIST'S religion. And that two other Bishops, together with Dr. Redmayn and Dr. Cox, delivered a similar opinion in still stronger terms; and that several of them quoted Jerome as a decisive authority in support of their opinion.'

Well, Sir, I told you that there is no heterodoxy in this opinion. Bishop and Presbyter were two names for the same officer, the Apostles then being the superior officers in the Christian Church. And I can 'lay my hand upon my heart, and say, that I consider such answer agreeable to my principles:' for it is what I have repeatedly acknowledged, and what Episcopalians generally acknowledge, that the second order had a double title. This occasioned no inconvenience during the lives of the Apostles, whose superior authority all acknowledged. But this community of names, since the Reformation, has given rise to fallacious and specious reasoning, which, previous to that time, never existed in the Church. If the fact was, that the Prelates of after ages succeeded to the second order, who were indifferently styled Bishops or Presbyters, the argument would be conclusive against us; but when we maintain and prove by such abundant evidence, that the Apostles conveyed to *single* persons, and not to a plurality, their own *mastership* (as Irenæus speaks) or superiority in the government of the Church, we think it arrant trifling to urge any thing from the community of names. But so it is, and so it will be, for a very good reason—it throws a degree of obscurity over the question.

If, Sir, you had consulted Collier, you would have found all the 'questions and answers' at full length. These he took from Stillingfleet's manuscripts, and Burnet's history. This, I hope, will satisfy you as to Collier's fidelity and correctness. The amount of the whole is this. Cranmer, the Bishop elect of Westminster, Dr. Cox, and Dr. Redmayn, say, that, at the beginning, they (Bishops and Presbyters) were all one. The Bishops of York, London, Rochester, Carlisle—Drs. Day, Tresham, Symmons, and Oglethorpe, were of a different opinion. The Bishop of York and Dr. Tresham think, that the Apostles were first Priests, and after were made Bishops, when the overseeing of other Priests was committed to them. The Bishops of Durham, London, Carlisle, Rochester, Drs. Symmons, and Crafford, think that the Apostles first were Bishops, and afterwards made other Bishops and Priests. Drs. Coren and Oglethorpe say, that the Apostles were made Bishops, and the seventy-two were afterwards made Priests. Dr. Day thinks, that Bishops, as they are now called, were before Priests.

The Bishop of London, Drs. Edgworth, Redmayn, and Ro-

Digitized by Google

bertson, think it no inconvenience, if a Priest make a Bishop in that time.[h]

Every one of these answers is decidedly in favour of prelacy, except the answer of the three last divines. But when you compare their answer on the 10th question with the answer they give on the 11th, it will be evident that by Priests *making* Bishops, they mean no more than *electing*. Thus Dr. Edgworth says, "A Bishop hath authority by Scripture to make a Priest, and that any other ever made a Priest since CHRIST's time, I read not. Albeit, Moses, who was not anointed Priest, made Aaron Priest and Bishop, by a special commission or revelation from GOD, without which he would never so have done."

Equally decisive is Dr. Redmayn. The 11th question has two parts. 1. "Whether a Bishop hath authority to make a Priest by the Scripture, or no? 2. Whether any other but only a Bishop may make a Priest?"

Now, thus Redmayn replies—"To the first part I answer, Yea; for so it appeareth, Tit. i. and 1 Tim. v. with other places of Scripture. But whether any other but only a Bishop may make a Priest, I have not read, but by singular privilege of GOD, as when Moses (whom divers authors say was not a Priest) made Aaron a Priest. Truth it is, that the office of a godly prince is to oversee the Church, and the Ministers thereof—but as for *making*, that is to say, ordaining and consecrating of Priests, I think it specially belongs to the office of a Bishop, as far as can be showed by Scripture, or any example, as I suppose, from the beginning."

Dr. Robertson also says, "I think that a Bishop has authority to make a Priest, provided it be done with the permission of the government. But whether it can be done rightly by any other than a Bishop, I do not know; though I do not remember to have read that it has been done by any other."

From these explanations, it is evident that these three divines, of whom alone there could be any doubt, were decidedly opposed to ordination by Presbyters; and, consequently, were good Episcopalians.[i]

Had you, Sir, been more attentive to the 'Questions and Answers,' and compared them with one another, you would, I presume, have been more careful in pronouncing our reformers not to have been Episcopalians on the ground of apostolical institution. Like honest men breaking loose from long established opinions, they were not hasty in their decisions, but in every step of their progress took Scripture and primitive usage for their guides. Their minds were but slowly illuminated; during the progress, therefore, we are not to look for that decision of opinion, and that perspicuity of language, for which they were

---

h COLLIER's *Eccles. Hist.* Collection of Records, p. 50, verse 2.

i BURNET, *Hist. of Reform.* Vol. III. p. 323, 324, 325, et seq. COLLIER, *Eccles. Hist.*, Records No. 49, p. 50.

Digitized by Google

afterwards distinguished, when their minds were completely and finally made up on the doctrines and government of the Church.

With respect to the time when these questions and answers were put out, we are, it seems, still at variance. You assert that the transaction took place in 1548; I assert that it took place in 1540. My authority is Burnet—yours is Stillingfleet, or perhaps Neal, who generally follows him. It is certain that Burnet places the business in 1540, as you will see by consulting his *History*, Vol. I. p. 289, and comparing it with his Collection, No. 21. He professes to use Stillingfleet's manuscripts, altering the date from 1548 to 1540, and we do not find that Stillingfleet ever disputed the point.

But were I to concede this point, it would be of no material consequence; for all agree that the transaction took place before the Ordinal and the Articles were framed. In them, it is beyond all controversy, that the three orders are said to have been instituted by the Apostles, under the direction of the HOLY GHOST. This, then, was the deliberate and final decision of the English reformers.

That any man who can consult the *Common Prayer Book* of the Church of England, should ever venture to assert, that her reformers did not place the superiority of Bishops on the ground of divine right, is to me one of the most extraordinary instances of hardihood that I have ever met with. Even Mosheim would have taught you better. He declares, that the Church of England "constantly insisted on the divine origin of its government and discipline."[k]

I have now, Sir, brought the question, with respect to the origin of episcopacy, to a conclusion. The evidence in favour of its apostolic sanction, appears to me to be next to irresistible. It is so abundant and so uniform, and universality of episcopacy is so unaccountable on any other ground, that I know not what greater degree of evidence an impartial mind can require. But I am no stranger to the imperious nature of early prejudice, to the force of party attachments, and to the mortification which pride sustains from relinquishing a long adopted opinion. Few men have strength of mind sufficient to burst these bonds. I do not, therefore, expect that many will see their error in being aliens from episcopal communion; but I *do* expect, that episcopalians who read this controversy will gather, from the force of the arguments and evidence produced, confidence in the goodness of their cause, and will be unalterably attached to that Church, in which there cannot be the least doubt of a valid ministry, and valid ordinances. I have also, I trust, settled the point with respect to the English reformers. Indeed, there is but one consideration necessary to be mentioned; that is, that the whole Ordinal of the Church proceeds upon the ground of a

k *Eccles. Hist.* Vol. II. p. 231.

Digitized by Google

divine institution. When a man knows this to be the fact, and yet wants to persuade his readers that Cranmer and his associates were Presbyterian in *principle*, he must have a way of thinking, which, I believe, very few would envy.

The controversy is, I conceive, now fairly ended. It is, therefore, totally needless for me to make any reply to all that follows in your last book. If I have proved episcopacy to be an apostolic institution, other points which you have introduced, if they were even proved, are of no manner of consequence. It is of no consequence to this dispute, whether the Waldenses were Episcopal; whether Calvin was ordained, and whether he was of a violent, persecuting spirit. It matters not whether Archbishop Grindal gave a license to Morrison to officiate in the Church of England without reordination, and whether he was one of the reformers. It is of no moment whether the reformed Church of Scotland was at first prelatical in form, or Presbyterian from the commencement of the reformation. In short, it matters not whether several unconnected, minor points, which you have introduced, are fairly stated by you or by me. These things are of no moment to you, if I have proved that episcopacy rests upon apostolic authority; but if I have not, it is of no moment to me to disprove every one of these particulars. Still I choose to take notice of the most material of these points, that our readers may see which of us is the more accurate. I shall be as short as I well can be in the observations which your statements will produce.

LETTER XIII.

Rev. Sir:

First, with respect to the Waldenses. The author who has most minutely examined the history of this people is Dr. Allix. When I wrote before, I had not his book: but now it lies before me. He says, that the Waldenses distinguished their clergy into three orders, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. In proof of this, he quotes, first, Bernard, Abbot of Foncaud, in his treatise against the sect of the Waldenses, Chap. vi. He charges them with usurping the Church Ministry, which, says Dr. Allix, is a false accusation. Now a Papist by 'the Church Ministry,' must necessarily mean a ministry which consists of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons.

2. The Doctor quotes Raynerus, who lived in 1250. He acknowledges that the Waldenses had their Bishops in Lombardy.

3. He quotes Matthew Paris, An. 1243, who speaks of a Bishop of the Paterines (or Waldenses) in Cremona, who was deposed for fornication.

Digitized by Google

4. Dr. Allix observes, that in the kingdom of Naples they had a Superior (or Bishop) who conferred orders in the city of Aquila.

5. He says, "We find the same thing in the kingdom of Bohemia, in the confession of faith they presented to Uladislaus, p. 836. "Ordinandi majoribus aut minoribus ordinibus, promovendi vita virtuosa in Christi fide, &c. [Of ordaining to the higher or lower orders; of promoting a virtuous life in the faith of CHRIST, &c.]

6. The Doctor asserts, that "the same is observed in an ancient abridgment of the opinions of the Waldenses, recorded by Wolfius. (*Lect. Memor.* ad Ann. 1160, p. 380.) They absolutely deny the Pope's primacy over all Churches, and more especially his power over all policies, that is, his power of both swords; neither do they hold that any other orders ought to be retained in the Church, but those of Priests, Deacons, and Bishops."

7. Allix says, that Guido Carmelita attributes to them the same discipline, according to the report of Alphonsus a Castro, (Lib. xi. p. 337.)

8. He quotes Claudius Sysselius *adversus errores Waldensium*, fol. 10. "Those whom they judge to be the best amongst them they appoint to be their Priests, to whom, upon all occasions, they have recourse, as to the vicars and successors of the Apostles." Now, that by the successors of the Apostles, the Catholics mean Bishops, is beyond all dispute.

9. He proves from Commenius, the only Bishop that survived the Bohemian persecution, that the Waldenses had Bishops; and that three Pastors of the Bohemian Church were sent to the Waldenses dwelling in Austria and Moravia, to receive episcopal consecration; and that the Churches of those States always acknowledged, that they had received the authority of laying on of hands, and external succession from the Waldenses. Allix further quotes Commenius as saying, "Forasmuch as the said Waldenses declared that they had lawful Bishops amongst them, and a lawful and uninterrupted succession from the Apostles themselves, they very solemnly created three of our Ministers Bishops, conferring upon them the power of ordaining Ministers, though they did not think fit to take upon them the name of Bishops, because of the anti-christian abuse of that name, contenting themselves with the name of Elders. [Mark this.] As to their union with the Waldenses, before it could be brought about, the good Waldenses were again dissipated; their Bishop, Stephen, being burnt at Vienna."

10. Allix observes, that this order continued till the year 1655, and, under the title of *Moderator*, governed the Churches of the Valleys for twelve years. He called synods, presided in them, and celebrated the function of laying on of hands, p. 208.[1]

---

1 See *Remarks upon the Ancient Church of Piedmont.*

Digitized by Google

11. He quotes Roger Hoveden, who gives an account of a letter of Henry, Abbot of Clairvaux, who, lamenting the corruption of Toulouse by these arch heretics, adds these words, "Yea, so far had this plague prevailed in the land, that they had not only made to themselves Priests and Bishops, but had also their Evangelists."[m]

12. Allix says, "We find in Matthew Paris a letter of the Bishop of Porto, the Pope's legate, written in the year 1228, to the Archbishop of Rouen, in which he mentions one Bartholomew, a Bishop of the heretics, who had removed himself into the country near Toulouse, where he created Bishops, and set rules to the Churches of his communion."[n]

13. "Lucas Tudensis speaks of one of their Bishops that was burnt."[o]

Lastly, I quoted Mosheim, who expressly declares that "the Waldenses had in their Ministry three orders, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons."

Let us now see, whether your evidence that the Waldenses were Presbyterian in principle and practice, will outweigh these pointed and numerous testimonies.

Your first testimony is from Paul Perrin, who was one of the Pastors of that people. Here I would remark, before I notice the quotations from Perrin, that both Mosheim and Allix had read him, and yet they declare that the Waldenses were Episcopalians. This is very strange, if Perrin, one of their Pastors, had borne a contrary testimony! Mosheim could have had no conceivable motive for making them Episcopal, as he was not an Episcopalian. The same observation cannot indeed be applied to Allix; but his character is a sufficient guarantee for his fidelity. His quotations too have every mark of fairness, and no one has ever attempted to show that they are not correctly given. The decision of two such men must, therefore, have great weight in settling a point of this nature; and nothing but clear, unequivocal evidence to the contrary, can be deemed a counterbalance to their testimonies.

That Perrin's evidence is not decisive, must appear to every impartial eye that inspects it. As the quotation is too long to be transcribed, I must beg our readers to read it as it stands in your sixth letter, p. 218, 219. [p. —— 2d *ed.*] I have read it over three times, and I declare that I cannot see a single word by which it can be determined, whether the Waldenses were Episcopal or Presbyterian. He speaks of *Pastors*, *Teachers*, *Elders;* but surely these words do not determine what was the form of government. Perrin can afford you but little support, if he furnishes nothing more to the purpose than you have quoted from him.

Your second quotation is from a Confession of Faith drawn up about the year 1220, in which it is declared that the functions

m Pages 185 and 186. n Page 108. o Ibid.

Digitized by Google

of Ministers consist in "preaching the word and administering sacraments," and that all other ministerial things may be reduced to the aforesaid. Still there is not so much as a shadow of proof; for the passage is just as applicable to Bishops as to Priests.

Your next quotation is equivocal. From the passage it does not appear whether the Waldenses mean to condemn Confirmation altogether; or whether they mean, that confining the administration of it to a Bishop has no ground at all in Scripture. Whichever they mean, it is nothing to the purpose. A Church may be erroneous in its notion of Confirmation, and yet be episcopal; or it may use that rite, and not think it a duty appropriated to Bishops by apostolical sanction. The Waldenses might think that the Church of Rome made Confirmation essential to salvation, and a Bishop absolutely necessary to administer that rite. But these notions they may deny, and still be Episcopalians; for *we* certainly deny their correctness; but I hope you will allow us to be strong advocates for imparity. We do not think either Bishops or Confirmation essentially necessary to salvation; but we *do* think Bishops essentially necessary to an apostolical Church. All this, then, is too vague to afford the least ground for the opinion that the Waldensian Church was not Episcopal.

'In the same work,' you say, 'it is expressly and repeatedly asserted, that the synods of the Waldenses were composed of Ministers and Elders;' and you observe, 'this mode of speaking is surely not Episcopal.'

Now, Sir, when it is considered that Commenius, the Bohemian Bishop, says that the three Presbyters who were consecrated Bishops by the Waldenses 'did not take upon them the name of Bishops, because of the anti-christian abuse of that name, contenting themselves with the name of Elders;' we shall perceive at once the reason why the Waldenses, whose principles, and usages, and government, were similar to those of the Bohemians, made so little use of distinctive titles. Attend to this particular, and you have a proof from fact, that the titles of *Ministers*, *Elders*, *Teachers*, *Pastors*, imply the orders of Bishop, Presbyter, and Deacon.

You go on. 'The same historian tells us, that *Waldo*, (from whose name that of the *Waldenses* is said to be derived) upon his departure from Lyons, came into Dauphiny, and thence, having erected some churches, and laid the foundation of those which have been miraculously preserved there to this day, he went into Languedoc, and left some notable pastors there, who set up and governed those churches, which afterwards cost the Pope and his Clergy so much pains to destroy.' And on this you observe, that 'Waldo himself was no prelate; neither can we suppose that the Pastors whom he left in Languedoc were prelates. Yet these Pastors *set up and governed churches*.'

The first error in this quotation is, that the *Waldenses* were named after *Peter Waldo*, a merchant of Lyons, who died about

Digitized by Google

the year 1160. This, Dr. Allix shows, originated with the Papists, for the purpose of bringing down their date as low as possible, and to make their origin contemptible. He proves, by evidence unanswerable, that they existed long before Peter Waldo, and that they were called *Wallenses* (which is their proper name) from their dwelling in the *Valleys* of Piedmont. They were also called *Vaudois* for the same reason, and, more anciently, *Paterines*, because they received their doctrines and ministry from the Churches of Milan and Lombardy, which separated from the Church of Rome in the eleventh century, but were afterwards recovered by those arts for which the Church of Rome is so famous; so that, become what may of the government of the congregations formed by Waldo in Languedoc and Dauphiny, the Wallenses of Piedmont will not be at all affected. It is very probable that a great number of the disciples of Waldo, to avoid the persecutions that were raised against them by the Church of Rome, fled into the Valleys of Piedmont, and there mixing with the Waldenses or Vaudois, became one people, and went indifferently under the three names.

Another observation that I have to make is, that Waldo, for any thing that appears to the contrary, was never either Bishop or Presbyter. When he began to oppose the Church of Rome, and to collect disciples, he was a merchant of Lyons, and not a Romish priest;—who then, I pray, could have ordained him? Surely not the Archbishop of Lyons, nor any Bishop in his province, when he was in open rebellion against their authority! If he ever was ordained, it must have been by some Bishop of the Vaudois, or by laymen. If the former, how can you tell whether to the office of a Bishop or Priest? If by laymen, it was a mere farce, and Waldo's pastors, like himself, were no pastors. So that, in truth, nothing but darkness rests upon the accounts of the disciples of Waldo. The probability is, that their ministry was nothing more than a lay-ministry, if the term may be admitted, and then you will certainly derive from it no advantage to your cause.

What you quote from Gillis hardly deserves notice after what has been said. You quote him as saying, that their "Pastors in their ordinary assemblies came together, and held a synod once a year, and most generally in the month of September, at which they examined the students, and admitted them to the ministry."

Again: In the Confession of Faith, according to Gillis, the Waldenses declare that, "It is necessary for the Church to have *Pastors* esteemed sufficiently learned, and exemplary in their conduct, as well to preach God's word as to administer the sacraments, and watch over the sheep of Jesus Christ, together with the *Elders* and *Deacons*, according to the rules of good and holy Church discipline, and the practice of the primitive Church."

Here again we have nothing but general names. *Pastors* and *Ministers* include both Bishops and Presbyters, who are the

Digitized by Google

watchmen, shepherds, and governors of the flock. Episcopalians talk in the same manner, when they have no particular reason for distinguishing Bishops from Presbyters. I have several times heard, and often read, sermons by Episcopalians, on ministerial duties, in which not a word has been said about Bishops. But surely it would be ridiculous to infer from this, that the preachers were not Episcopalians. Such kind of evidence can be of no weight against the numerous positive testimonies which I have produced, both from friends and foes, that the Church of the Waldenses was Episcopal.

After you have finished the evidence by which you think to establish the ministerial parity of the Waldenses, you observe—'Here is better testimony than Thuanus or Walsingham, than Mosheim or Allix.' This is really curious. One would suppose, from this observation, that *I* had quoted Thuanus and Walsingham, when the fact is, that *you* had enlisted them on your side of the question. I did not quote them at all on this subject. Now it seems their testimony is good for nothing. Be it so.

But, 'Bellarmine acknowledges that the Waldenses denied the divine right of prelacy.' Very likely. And, no doubt, he denied that they had any ministry whatever. With this they were generally charged by the Papists. No less a man than the Bishop of Meaux endeavours to prove it; but Dr. Allix has clearly shown, from their own writers, that it is an impudent falsehood; and further, he has proved that they derived their ministry from the Italian diocese, or the Churches of Milan and Lombardy. The truth is, that they were loaded with the most infamous calumnies, and persecuted in the most cruel manner, to the eternal disgrace of the Church of Rome. What such furious zealots as Bellarmine say against them, is of very little consequence; and particularly when he is contradicted by the more candid in his own communion.

But Professor Raignolds asserts, that the Waldenses taught that "all Pastors, whether styled Bishops or Presbyters, have one and the same authority by the word of GOD." Very well. Raignolds was as liable to mistake as Dr. Miller. What either asserts, in opposition to the numerous and positive testimonies produced, has not the weight of a feather in the scale of evidence.

Let our readers now weigh, with impartiality, the testimonies on both sides, and if they can believe that the Waldenses were maintainers of *parity*, they must have a way of appreciating evidence to which I am an utter stranger.

You next endeavour to prove, that the dissenters from the Church of Rome, in Bohemia, were not Episcopalians. To establish this, you quote their *Book of Order*, or *Discipline*. From the quotation it appears, that they had *superintendents*, conspicuous for age and gifts, chosen by the suffrages of all the ministers for the keeping of order—that they had four, five, or six, and that each had his diocese—that their dignity was not

Digitized by Google

founded in the prerogative of honours or revenues, but of labours and cares for others; for that, according to the Apostles' rules, a Presbyter and Bishop are *one and the same thing*.

Now, from this same *Book of Order* or *Discipline*, the title of which is in Latin, *Ratio Disciplinæ Ordinisque Ecclesiastici in Unitate Fratrum Bohemorum*, I present again the following quotation. "And whereas the said Waldenses did affirm that they had lawful Bishops, and a lawful *uninterrupted succession from the Apostles unto this day;* they solemnly created three of our ministers Bishops, and conferred upon them power to ordain ministers." This is positive and perfectly decisive.

This account, as I have already shown, is confirmed by Commenius, the only survivor of the Bishops that escaped from the Bohemian persecution. And this was done, according to him, "that they may fully satisfy the scruples, as well of their own conscience, as of others." One of the persons sent was Michael Zambergius, who had been ordained Priest by the Bishop of Rome himself. Now these three persons could not have been sent to the Bishops of the Waldenses, two of whom they found, and by whom they were consecrated Bishops, merely to be made superintendents. For, by the quotation you have given, that superiority was conferred simply by the election of the ministers. They were, therefore, sent to receive the power of ordaining, which, as Presbyters, the Bohemian Church thought they had not.

And as to their being called *Superintendents*, if you will but advert to what Commenius says, "that they (the three Presbyters consecrated Bishops) did not take upon them the name of Bishop, on account of the anti-christian abuse of that name," the obscurity and seeming inconsistency in the passages which have been quoted on both sides, are effectually removed. This account is confirmed by Crantz, in his *Ancient History of the Brethren*. "The Waldenses," says he, "traced the succession of their Bishops from the apostolic times. They (the Bohemians) despatched three of their Priests already ordained (amongst whom Michael of Zamberg is mentioned) into Austria, to Stephen, Bishop of the Waldenses, who rejoiced at the account of the brethren's emigration and regulations, and laid before them in the presence of the Elders, the rise and progress, the various vicissitudes, and the episcopal succession of the Waldenses, and consecrated them, with the assistance of his co-bishop, and the rest of the clergy, Bishops of the Brethren's Church."[p]

We have a similar account in a *Compendium of the History of the Church of the United Brethren*, "written by a venerable Bishop," says Latrobe, "and dedicated to the youth of the said Church." "The Vallenses," says this author, "traced their doctrines, and the succession of their Bishops, from the Apostles, and the primitive Christian Church."[q]

---

p Page 29. q Chap. V. page 23.

Digitized by Google

Again: "Commenius took steps to preserve the episcopal ordination of the dispersed Church of the Brethren, that they might not want Ministers of their own Church regularly ordained. At a synod, therefore, held in 1662, Nicholas Gertichius and Paul Jablonsky, were consecrated Bishops; the former for the congregations in Poland, and the latter for the dispersed in and out of Bohemia and Moravia. The latter, who was son in law to Commenius, died before him. But his son, Daniel Ernestus Jablonsky, succeeded to the episcopal charge in 1669; and by this venerable man the episcopal ordination of the Church of the Brethren was, in 1735, transmitted to the Brethren who had fled from Moravia to Hernhut."[r]

If, Sir, you wish to see the episcopate of the Moravian Brethren, from David Nitschman, consecrated in 1735 by Jablonsky, at Berlin, up to Stephen, Bishop of the Waldenses in 1467, you will find it in Crantz, page 77. The whole list names sixty-seven Bishops. Thus we have the testimony of the whole Moravian Church, to the episcopacy of the Bohemians and Waldenses. This removes every thing like doubt upon the subject.

It is of some consequence also to observe, that the Moravian Church, "after," says Crantz, "strict and repeated examination, were acknowledged to be an ancient Protestant Episcopal Church, by the Parliament of Great Britain."[s]

In like manner, "the deplorable condition of this Protestant Episcopal Church in Poland was so well known in England, that an Order of the Privy Council was issued on the 10th of March, 1715, *for their relief, and for preserving the remainder of the Episcopal Churches in Great Poland and Polish Prussia.* This order of the Council was granted upon the humble petition of the Bishops and Clergy of the Reformed Episcopal Churches, first settled in Bohemia, and since forced by the persecutions of their enemies to retire into the Greater Poland and Polish Prussia; and obtained for them, upon a representation made to his Majesty by Dr. William Wake, Archbishop of Canterbury, and Dr. John Robinson, Bishop of London." See the preface of the editor of Crantz's history.

"Archbishop Wake," continues the editor, "did not act herein merely as a humane Christian, without inquiry. He wrote to Dr. Daniel Ernest Jablonsky, Dean of the Chapel of the King of Prussia, and eldest Bishop of the Unity at that period, desiring an account of the Churches of the Brethren. To which Dr. Jablonsky gave him a full and satisfactory answer, proving their episcopal succession, and showing the former flourishing, and the present distressed state of their Churches."

The editor also produces the "Report of the Associates of the late Dr. Bray, for propagating Christianity among the Negroes:" in which report, the Moravian Church is acknowledged as *apostolical* and *episcopal.*

---

r Chap. xviii. page 128.

s Page 353.

Digitized by Google

The editor also exhibits Archbishop Potter's congratulatory letter to Count Zinzendorf, upon his having been consecrated a Bishop. For the letter see the preface.

Thus we have the testimony of the Privy Council of the King, of the Parliament of Great Britain, and of the Bishops and Clergy of the Church of England, to the episcopacy of the Moravians, and virtually to the episcopacy of the Bohemians and Waldenses; and also the explicit testimonies of the whole Moravian Church to the episcopacy of those persecuted people. If any man can resist this evidence, it is not worth while to reason with him.

But all this will not do; for my favourite author, Dr. Heylin, says, 'that the Bohemian Churches were not episcopal.' Pray, Sir, who told you that he is a favourite author of mine? I am certain that I have not; and I am also certain, that I have not quoted him in my first work to establish any point of the least consequence. But you are so much in the habit of ascribing to me what I have not said, and when I have spoken in the most explicit manner, of telling your readers that I have said quite the contrary, that I do not wonder now at any thing that drops from your pen! To be short and plain with you—I consider you as a very uncandid adversary.

When I inform you that I have a very high opinion of Dr. Heylin's accuracy, it will be time enough to consider his testimony as of great weight on this or any other point. That I regard it as of no consequence in the present occasion is very certain; and that you also must view it in the same light, if consistency be preserved, is also very certain; for he says, according to your quotation, that they had neither Bishops nor Superintendents, which, as to the latter, directly contradicts your extract from the *Book of Order and Discipline.* So that, in the opinion of both of us, he is in an error; in your opinion, as to Superintendents; in mine, as to Bishops. And thus the matter ends.

What comes next?—It is no less than my vain, imprudent, inconsistent attempt 'to destroy the character of Wickliffe, in order to diminish the weight of his evidence in favour of original parity.' Now, gentle reader, be it known unto thee, that I have not said one word against Wickliffe's moral and religious character, nor have I given the least glance at him in these respects. The "very head and front" of my crime is, that I have quoted Collier's list of errors into which Wickliffe fell; but, at the same time, warning the reader not to place implicit confidence in the view given of his principles, as that view is what we receive, in some particulars, from the Papists only. But when several of his errors are charged upon him by Protestant writers also, who can have no interest in so doing, there can remain no doubt of the fact.

The next particular that I shall advert to, is the case of Morrison. This may be settled in a few words. A license was

Digitized by Google

granted to him by Grindal, to officiate as a Minister in the Church of England; therefore the Archbishop thought presbyterian orders valid. This I did not deny. But I want to know, how this proves that Grindal did not hold the apostolic institution of episcopacy? This was the point that I maintained in my reply to your Letters. I expressly stated that I would not examine the question, whether this doctrine, if true, would destroy your orders; and I further observed, that there is a difference of opinion even among Episcopalians on this question. But you do not seem ever to recollect this. It appears to me, that you wish to make your readers believe that, if a man does not deny the validity of orders conferred by Presbyters, he must of course believe prelacy to be a human institution. But this, you must certainly know, is not a correct alternative. You must certainly know, that many maintain the one without maintaining the other. Grindal, we must conclude, was of this number, on the supposition that he was an honest man; for he subscribed to the Liturgy, Articles, Doctrine, and Discipline of the Church of England, in which episcopacy, as an apostolic and divine institution, is asserted in the most explicit and positive terms.

A few more words. Grindal, you still maintain, was one of the reformers: I still maintain that he was not. But let us understand one another. By a reformer, I mean one of those divines who were appointed by royal authority to frame the Articles and the Offices of the Church. That he was not one of these is beyond all doubt. No historian exhibits his name in the list of reformers. That he was a zealous advocate for the reformation is very true, and so were many others, who never were called reformers. This title was appropriate to Cranmer and his associates under Henry VIII. and Edward VI. and was never extended to those who were concerned in the subsequent revisions of the Prayer Book in the reign of Elizabeth and Charles II. Now, I suppose, we understand one another. Will you, after this, venture to assert that I am not correct?

The next particular which you re-produce is the act passed in the 13th year of the reign of Elizabeth. You observe, 'Dr. B. admits that there was an act passed which admitted into the Church of England those who had received ordination in the foreign reformed Churches, on their subscribing the Articles of Faith.' Now, here is another instance of your ascribing to me what I have not said, although my book was before your eyes. My words stand in direct opposition to the acknowledgment you have framed for me. In Letter 15th I thus speak—'That there was an act passed in the 13th of Elizabeth *to reform certain disorders*, &c. is true; but that it was with an express view of admitting into the Church those who had received presbyterian ordination, does not appear at all from the act.' But to let this pass. I observed, that the case of the foreign Presbyterian Churches, and the validity of ordination by Presbyters, were not at all contemplated. There is not a syllable said about

Digitized by Google

either. It speaks, indeed, of those who pretended to be Priests by an ordinal different from that of King Edward's; but by that was principally, if not exclusively meant, such as were ordained by the Popish Ordinal. But what a valid ordination is, the act does not say. We must have recourse for *that* to the Preface of the Ordinal, which expressly makes episcopal ordination the only mode. Now, unless the act passed in the 13th year of Elizabeth was intended to repeal that passed in the reign of Edward, and confirmed in the 8th of Elizabeth, which certainly was not the case, the two acts would have stood in direct opposition to each other. But this can never be admitted.

But, for the sake of argument, I will concede this point, and allow all that you contend for; that is, that the act was intended to comprehend foreign divines holding benefices, as well as Popish Priests; the only consequence is, that the ordination of the reformed Churches, proceeding from necessity, and not conducted in schism, was deemed valid. But the indulgence being only for a few months, and the exclusion for ever, after the Feast of the Nativity, the act carries with it a disapprobation of such ordinations. And this we must necessarily admit, as it had been determined both by Church and State, in the reign of Edward, and confirmed by the act of the 8th of Elizabeth, that, by the appointment of the HOLY SPIRIT, there are "divers orders of Ministers in the Church." So that the divine right of episcopacy, which had been declared by a great national act to be the faith of the Church, is not, in the slightest degree, retracted by the 13th of Elizabeth, even if that act admitted the validity of ordination by Presbyters under particular circumstances. But I still deny that the act has any reference whatever to the validity or invalidity of such ordinations.

From these observations it is very evident, that it is of no manner of consequence whether I am right or wrong in my conjecture, that some of the exiles went into Sweden or Denmark; or whether Strype is correct in confining the view of the act to the ordinations of *some* of the reformed Churches, which necessarily excludes a part of them. You might, therefore, have spared your unbecoming interrogatories, without in the least diminishing your consequence, either as a disputant, or as a gentleman.

But all this is of very little consequence. What comes next is of more weight, although not at all affecting the main question between us. You say, (Letter VI.) 'But one of the most extraordinary parts of Dr. B.'s work, is that in which he attempts to show that the reformed Church of Scotland, as first established by Knox and his associates, was not presbyterian, but prelatical in its form. Nay, he goes so far as to assert, in conformity with the misrepresentations of Sage, Collier, Spotswood, and Skinner, [pretty good company, one would think] that in that Church ministerial parity was disclaimed; that Superintendents, with episcopal jurisdiction, were established;

Digitized by Google

and that presbyterianism had no existence in that country until 1580, twenty years after the reformation was established. The man who can write thus, discovers a want of information, or a force of prejudice, which renders him a much more proper object of compassion than resentment. The statement is not only not true, but diametrically contrary to the truth, and advanced in direct opposition to all authentic testimony. This is so notoriously the case, that I did not suppose it possible for any well informed man, at the present day, to give such a representation as Dr. B. has given.'

After this stately piece of declamation, you give us an extract from the first *Book of Discipline*, drawn up by Knox and others. 'In that book, the ministry is spoken of as consisting of a *single order*—*Ruling Elders* and *Deacons* are described—*Kirk-sessions*, *Presbyteries*, and *Synods*, are expressly laid down.'

Now, Sir, notwithstanding all the astonishment, and confidence, and compassion you express, I still maintain my assertion, that the *Scotch Superintendents* had all the powers of Bishops, and that there was nothing wanting but consecration to have made them such. I still maintain that *parity* was disclaimed, and, consequently, that the first settlement of the Scotch Church was not on the presbyterian plan. We are now fairly at issue on a point of fact, and let our readers judge between us.

I wonder, Sir, that you did not consult Sage's *Presbytery Untwisted*, before you ventured to expose yourself on this subject; for, believe me, you have exposed yourself most egregiously. Could I pity you, I would; but I really cannot pity a man who is so consummately imprudent, and so disgustingly confident.

Before I proceed to the proof of my assertion, let me remind you, that the *imparity* which I ascribe to the first plan of reformation in Scotland, is that of *degree*, not of *order*; for I expressly say, that the Superintendents had not episcopal consecration, and, consequently, could not be of a superior order; still, *parity* was rejected.

Sage has enumerated thirty particulars, in which the Superintendents were superior to the Presbyters. I will select a few of them.

1. Superintendents had districts or dioceses of great extent. By the *first Book of Discipline*, there were but ten or twelve designed for the whole kingdom. *Sage*, p. 121. *Spotswood*, p. 158.

2. There was a great difference in the election of parish Ministers and Superintendents. The former were presented to the living by the patron, and *collated* by the Superintendent, as is evident from Act 7, Parliament 1. James VI. and many Acts of Assemblies. The latter were nominated by the council, and elected by the nobility and gentry.

3. There was a remarkable difference in point of ordination, which, in the Scottish style, was called *admission*. Private Ministers were ordained by the Superintendents; but by the

Digitized by Google

First Book of Discipline, Chap. V. the latter were to be admitted by the Superintendents next adjacent, with the Ministers of the province.

4. It belonged to the Superintendents to try those who were candidates for the ministry. Thus, 1 *B. Disc.* Chap. 4. "Such as take upon them the office of preachers, who shall not be found qualified therefor by the Superintendent, are by him to be placed readers;" and more to the same purpose.

5. A Superintendent had power to plant ministers in churches where the people did not present in time. The time allowed was forty days. *B. Disc.* Chap. iv.

6. He had the power of ordination, which was then called *admission* (as already noticed.) This is evident from the *Book of Discipline*, and several Acts of Assemblies.

7. All parish Ministers, once admitted to churches, were bound to pay *canonical obedience* to their Superintendents. Thus in the Assembly at Edinburgh, June 30, 1562, "It was concluded by the whole Ministers assembled, that all Ministers should be subject to the Superintendents in all lawful admonitions, as is prescribed, as well in the *Book of Discipline*, as in the election of Superintendents." So the Manuscripts. And in the Act, Dec. 25, 1562, "Ministers translated from one Church to another, are commanded to obey the voice and commandment of the Superintendent."

8. He had the power to visit all the churches within his diocese; and "to try the life, diligence, and behaviour of the Ministers, the order of their churches, the manners of their people, how the poor are provided, and how the youth are instructed," &c. *B. Disc.* Chap. v. *Spotswood*, p. 159.

9. He had power to *depose* Ministers that deserved it. *B. Disc.* Chap. viii. *Assemb. Edinb.* March 6, 1573. Mansct. *Petrie*, 378. He had also power to translate Ministers from one Church to another. *Assemb. Edinb.* Dec. 25, 1562.

10. He had power to nominate ministers to be members of the General Assembly. *Act. Edinb. Assemb.* June, 1562, and July 1, 1563. *Spotswood, Refutatio Libelli.*

11. Superintendents had power to hold *diocesan synods. Act of Ass.* Dec. 1562. Mansct. and *Petrie*, 123. The act runs thus—"That the Superintendents appoint synodal conventions twice in the year, viz. in the months of April and October, on such days of the said months as the Superintendents shall think good." They had also power to appoint diocesan fasts. *Act. Ass. Edinb.* March 5, 1570. Mansct. and *Petrie*, 369.

12. It belonged to Superintendents to judge of divorces. Thus, *Assemb. Edinb.* Dec. 25, 1562, (Msct.) ordains, "That no Ministers, nor others bearing office in the Kirk, take in hand to cognosce or decide in the actions of divorcement, except the Superintendents, and they to whom they shall give special commission."

13. It was a branch of their power to enjoin penance to greater

Digitized by Google

criminals. *Ass. Edinb.* July 25, 1564, (Msct.) and March 5, 1571.

14. To them was referred the power of excommunication in cases of contumacy, &c. *Gen. Ass. Edinb.* July 1, 1562. Sept. 25, 1565. Msct. and *Petrie*, 346.

15. It belonged to them to present atrocious criminals to the civil magistrate, that corporeal punishments may be inflicted upon them. *Convent. Edinb.* Dec. 15, 1567. Msct.

Thus, Sir, I have given you just one half of the particulars in which Superintendents were superior to parish Ministers; and if you will prove from all this, that *parity* was established by the Church of Scotland, at the *reformation*, you will certainly display an acuteness far beyond any thing this world has hitherto seen.

But it seems, if you are right, that this office of Superintendent arose merely out of the necessity of the times, and was not intended to be perpetual. If this were true, it would afford you no relief; for the fact that *imparity* was established in the Church of Scotland at the reformation, is proved beyond the possibility of controversy, and this is all that I am bound to make out.

But, Sir, it is not true that the prelacy of Superintendents was a temporary expedient, to be laid aside at a convenient time. This point also Sage has completely settled, in answer to Calderwood and Petrie, two merciless persecutors of episcopacy.

The first argument produced by Sage in favour of the intended perpetuity of Superintendents, is, that the compilers of the *First Book of Discipline* were generally men of prelatical principles. In Knox's *History*, p. 283, the number is said to have been six; John Winrame, who died Superintendent of Strathern —John Spotswood, who was many years a Superintendent, and a constant enemy to parity—John Willock, who died Superintendent of the west—John Douglas, who died Archbishop of St. Andrews—John Row, who was one of the three that defended episcopacy at the Conference in 1575—and John Knox himself, who was at that time (as will be proved) a decided prelatist. Now, says Sage, I ask, is it credible, that these men, so much for prelacy all their lives, without any constraint on them, should, while digesting a mode of policy, have been for a prelacy that was to be laid aside so soon as the parish churches could be planted with Ministers? I know nothing that can be said here, unless it be that Knox was not so prelatical as the rest, and he would have it so, and the rest yielded. But there is no ground for this. For Knox himself, in his *History*, assigns a different reason for the appointment of Superintendents than the necessities of the Church. It was done, according to him, "that all things might be carried with order and well,"—a reason, says Sage, as it has held since the Apostle's times, will continue to hold so long as the Church continues. It is also said in the same *History*, (p. 289) that at the admission of Spotswood to the Superintendency of Lothian, John Knox, in his sermon,

Digitized by Google

asserted *the necessity of Superintendents or Overseers*, as well as Ministers. It is also evident from his *Exhortation to England*, that he was a friend to well regulated prelacy. "Let no man," says he, "be charged in preaching of CHRIST JESUS above that which a man may do: I mean, that your Bishopricks be so divided, that of every one may be made ten;" by which it appears, that he was for a great number of Bishops, and small dioceses.

Further: Knox had a principal hand in compiling the *First Book of Discipline*. Now, asks Sage, "is not *imparity* fairly established there? Did he not write and bear the letter sent by the Superintendents, Ministers, and Commissioners of the Church within the realm of Scotland, to their brethren, the Bishops and Pastors in England, An. 1566? Did he not in that same title of that same letter acknowledge, that these brethren, Bishops and Pastors in England, had renounced the Roman Anti-christ, and professed the LORD JESUS in sincerity? And doth not the letter all along allow of the episcopal power and authority of these English Bishops? Did he not publicly and solemnly admit Mr. John Spotswood to the Superintendency of Lothian, An. 1561? Did he not concur at the coronation of King James VI. with a Bishop and two Superintendents, An. 1567? Did he not sit, and vote, and concur in many General Assemblies, where acts were made for performing *canonical obedience* to Superintendents? In fine, doth not Spotswood tell us, (p. 266) that he was far from the dotages wherein some that would be thought his followers did afterwards fall? That never man was more obedient to Church authority than he? That he was always urging the obedience of Ministers to their Superintendents; for which he caused divers acts to be made in the assemblies of the Church; and that he was severe to the transgressors?" Sage gives many more proofs of Knox's prelatical principles; but surely this is enough for any man on whom competent evidence can make an impression.

Seeing, then, that every one concerned in compiling the *First Book of Discipline* was friendly to prelacy, it affords a strong presumption that *imparity* of Ministers was designed to be a perpetual ordinance in the Church of Scotland.

Again: "If any Superintendent shall depart this life, or happen to be deposed," rules are laid down for supplying the vacancy. But to what purpose, if Superintendency was to be of so short continuance? *Spotswood*, p. 159.

Further: "After the Church shall be established, and three years are past, no man shall be called to the office of a Superintendent, who hath not, two years at least, given a proof of his faithful labours in the ministry of some Church." What could more plainly import that the office was to be durable? *Ibid.* p. 160.

Once more: "when this *Book of Discipline* comes to the business of the Universities, it supposes, that Superintendents

Digitized by Google

and Colleges were to be of equal continuance; for the Superintendent was still to be at the choosing and instalment of Principals and Rectors; and the money collected for upholding the fabric was to be collected and counted yearly on the 15th of November, *in the presence of the Superintendent of the bounds*, and employed with his advice, &c." *Spotswood*, p. 162. *Sage*, p. 145, 146, 147.

This is certainly enough. If you wish for more, my author will give you abundantly more than you can readily digest.

I now appeal to every reader of this controversy be he Episcopalian or Presbyterian, learned or unlearned, wise or foolish, whether I have not proved my assertion, that the Church of Scotland was reformed on a principle of imparity? I will now show my want of information with respect to another assertion, viz. that it was twenty years from the first reformation, to the time when parity was introduced into that ill-fated Church. On this head I shall be very short.

That presbyterian government was not introduced into the Church of Scotland till the year 1580, is capable of such proofs as no human mind can possibly resist.

1. Some years after the first settlement, the polity of the Church was brought still nearer to the model before the reformation. The General Assembly meeting at Stirling, in the month of August, 1571, "gave commission to certain brethren to go to the Lord Regent his Grace, and to the Parliament, humbly to request and desire, in the name of the Kirk, the granting of such heads and articles, and redress of such complaints, as should be given to them by the Kirk," &c. Mscts. *Spotswood*, p. 258. *Petrie*, p. 371.

The Earl of Lenox was then Regent. He was murdered in the time of the parliament. This event threw every thing into confusion, and nothing could be done at that time for the Church. The Earl of Mar succeeded in the Regency. Application was made to him, and it was agreed that commissioners should be appointed on the part of the Clergy and the State for adjusting matters. An Assembly was held at Leith on the 12th of January, 1572. It was then agreed that the *old polity* should be revived; and that the old prelatical names and titles of Archbishops and Bishops, and the old division of the dioceses should take place, and generally that the old rights and privileges should be restored. This was the *second model* of polity in the Church of Scotland after the reformation. "The truth is," says Sage, "that both Calderwood and Petrie acknowledge it was *imparity* with a witness." This imparity was confirmed by repeated Acts of the General Assembly, and all things went on in a peaceable and regular course, till Andrew Melville returned from Geneva, in July, 1574. "He had lived," says my author, "in that city, under the influence of Theodore Beza. He was a man, by nature, fierce and fiery, confident and peremptory, peevish and ungovernable. Education in him had not sweetened

Digitized by Google

nature, but nature soured education, and both conspiring together, had tricked him into a true original—a piece compounded of pride and petulance, of satire and sarcasm, of venom and vehemence. He hated the crown as much as the mitre, the sceptre as much as the crosier; and could have made as bold with the purple as with the rochet. His prime talent was lampooning. In a word, he was the very *archetypal, bitter beard* of the party."[t]

"This man, thus accoutred, was scarcely warm at home, when he began to disseminate his sentiments. For this," says Sage, "I have Melville's own words, in a letter to Beza, dated November 13th, 1579. The first words of the letter are—We have not ceased these five years to fight against Pseud-episcopacy, &c. Now, reckon five years backward, and you stand at November, 1574, by which we find, that within three or four months after his arrival the plot was begun, although it was near a year after before it came above board."[u]

On the 6th of August, 1575, the General Assembly met at Edinburgh. Here, says Sage, "John Durie stood up and protested against *the office and name of a Bishop*. The hare thus started, Melville, the original huntsman, strait pursued her." But for this time, after much debating, Melville was defeated, and *imparity* stood its ground.

A second attempt was made in the Assembly held at Edinburgh, April 24, 1576. But in this second effort Melville was also defeated.

Still this arch-corrupter of the Church persevered. In every subsequent Assembly he gained some ground, by his art, his intrigue, his falsehood, his unconquerable spirit, and, in no small degree, by the influence of the Earl of Morton. At last, the Parliament which met at Dundee, July 12th, 1580, established a presbyterian regimen for the Church of Scotland, to the grief, and with the execration of thousands in that kingdom. And thus I have shown, with a force of evidence which the mind cannot resist, that Dr. Miller, not Dr. B. wants information on this subject.[v]

I have been the longer upon this point, because I believe it is a common error, among both Presbyterians and Episcopalians, that the Church of Scotland was reformed on the principle of *parity*. But I hope this short sketch will give to those into whose hands it may fall, more correct ideas on this subject; and that even yourself will not disdain *ab hoste doceri* [to be taught by an adversary.]

The next point deserving of notice is, the different accounts which we give of Luther's opinion with respect to this subject.

It is certainly a very improper way of deciding a controversy

---

t *Presbytery Untwisted*, p. 217, 218. u *Ibid.*

v Whoever wishes to see the whole process of the business should consult SAGE's *Presbytery Untwisted*. The whole narrative is curious, but at the same time disgusting.

Digitized by Google

of this nature, to appeal to the opinion of A, B, and C. Men are so much influenced by prejudice, by passion, by interest, and by a variety of peculiar circumstances, that it is extremely difficult for them to give to evidence its proper weight, and to submit to it when it is not friendly to their prepossessions. Luther was not totally free from the prejudice of a popish education. For two hundred years before his time, it had been pretty generally believed by the school men, that Bishop and Presbyter did not differ in *order*, but in *degree*. This opinion was broached, as I have already observed, to exalt the dignity of the priestly character, by which bread could be changed into the real body of CHRIST. With this opinion Luther was infected, and would, therefore, speak of Bishop and Presbyter as being of *one order*. This accounts for that mode of expression which we sometimes meet with in the early reformers and the popish divines before the reformation. But still they admitted a prelacy in degree, which makes the difference little more than a dispute about words.

You charge me with endeavouring to persuade my readers, that Luther believed in the divine right of diocesan episcopacy; and to prove this you quote a passage from my fifteenth Letter. My words are, 'As to Luther, he professes that if the Popish Bishops would cease to persecute the Gospel, he and those of his communion would acknowledge them as their fathers, and willingly obey their authority, which (says he) *we find supported by the word of* GOD. Consequently, in his and their estimation, episcopacy was an apostolic institution.' On this passage you observe, 'Dr. B. has not given us the least hint in what part of Luther's writings this declaration is to be found;' and in a note you let me know that I do not adhere to my promise with respect to references. It is really, Sir, impossible to guard every thing against the complaints of a captious disposition. I particularly referred to Dr. Chandler's *Appeal Defended*, p. 239, for the quotation from Luther, and for that which immediately follows from Melancthon. This, to common sense, is a virtual declaration, that I did not take the quotations from the original authors. And yet you censure me for not doing, what a child would immediately perceive I did not intend to do. This is really hard treatment.

It is not an easy matter to determine what Luther and Calvin, and some others, circumstanced as they were, did really believe on this subject. There are so many passages in their writings which stand in direct opposition to one another, that I am totally at a loss what to think. If the passage which I have quoted from Dr. Chandler be authentic, (of which I have no doubt) it is pointedly in our favour; and yet the passages which you quote are directly against us. I also find Luther quoted by an anonymous author, on *The Right of Episcopacy*, as declaring the prelacy of episcopacy *above simple Presbyters by divine*

Digitized by Google

right; and he quotes his tract, called his *Resolutions*, Vol. I. folio, p. 309.[w]

Again: I find Bancroft, in his *Survey of the pretended Holy Discipline*, quoting from the *Augustan Confession*, p. 109, these words—"The Bishops might easily retain the obedience due unto them, if they urged us not to keep those traditions which we cannot keep with a good conscience."

Also—"We have oft protested, that we do greatly approve the ecclesiastical polity and degrees in the Church, and, as much as lieth in us, do desire to conserve them. We do not mislike the authority of Bishops—we do here protest that we would willingly preserve the ecclesiastical polity—that it may not be imputed to us, that the authority of Bishops is overthrown by us." *Apol. Aug. Conf.* p. 363.[x]

Again: "I would to God," said Melancthon, "it lay in me to restore the government of Bishops. For I see what manner of Church we shall have, the ecclesiastical polity being dissolved. I do see that hereafter will grow up a greater tyranny in the Church than there ever was before." *Apol. Aug. Conf.* p. 305.

Further: Melancthon asks, "By what right or law may we dissolve the ecclesiastical polity, if the Bishops will grant us that which in reason they ought to grant? And if it were lawful for us so to do, yet surely it were not expedient. *Luther was ever of this opinion.*" *Melanct.* Camerarius *Hist. Conf. August.* p. 389.

To the same effect, George, Prince of Anhalt, who was an ecclesiastic, says, "I would to God those which bear the names of Bishops, would show themselves to be Bishops indeed. Oh how willingly, and with what joy of heart would we receive them for our Bishops, reverence them, obey them, and yield unto them their Jurisdiction of ordination—which we always, and Luther, both in words and in his writings, very often have professed." *Conciones Georgii Princ. Anhalt.* p. 61. fol.

Numerous testimonies to this effect might be produced from the foreign Protestant divines. But surely these are sufficient to render it unquestionable, that Luther and his associates preferred prelacy to parity. And that they did so appears not only from their writings, but from matter of fact. For they established in Germany, *Superintending Prelates*, who, in point of jurisdiction, possess powers equal, at least, if not superior to those of our Bishops. This, indeed, does not involve the invalidity of ordination by mere Presbyters. But it goes so far as to involve a prelacy by apostolic authority. For the reason which they assign for this establishment, is the *well being* of the Church, to promote peace and order, and to prevent schisms. And surely the Apostles themselves could not have placed it on

---

w "Probo quamlibet civitatem habere debere Episcopum proprium jure divino, quod ex Paulo ad Titum ostendo dicente—hujus rei gratia reliqui te Cretæ," &c.

x BANCROFT, p. 110, 111.

Digitized by Google

a stronger foundation. Luther, therefore, must have deemed prelacy an apostolic appointment, unless you can suppose that he thought himself wiser than those who were under the direction of the HOLY GHOST.

The same observations are applicable to Calvin and several eminent divines of his persuasion. Many passages have been frequently quoted from him and them; but a few of them it may be expedient to quote again.

In his epistle to Sadolet, he says, "*Talem nobis hierarchiam si exhibeant*, &c. If they (the Papists) would exhibit to us such a hierarchy, wherein the Bishops shall so rule, as that they refuse not to submit themselves to CHRIST, that they so depend upon him as their only head, and be content to refer themselves to him—then surely if there shall be any who will not submit themselves to that hierarchy, I confess there is no kind of anathama or curse of which they are not worthy."

Again: in the same epistle he has these words—"Place before your eyes (I pray you) the ancient face of the Church, as it was amongst the Greeks in Chrysostom's and Basil's times; and as it was amongst the Latins, when Cyprian, Ambrose, and Augustine lived; and then behold the ruins of that face, as it is now in the Church of Rome. There will appear as great difference between them, as the prophets describe unto us between the excellent state of the Church that flourished under David and Solomon, and that Church, which, in Zedekiah's and Joachim's times, was fallen into all kind of superstition, and had defiled altogether the purity of the worship of GOD."

It is impossible for any Episcopalian to speak in higher terms than these. Calvin acknowledges that in the fourth century, the state of the Church was excellent; that it was in great purity, and as different from the corrupt state of the Romish Church in the sixteenth century, as the Jewish Church was when in the greatest purity, from the same Church in the lowest state of depravity. Now, nobody denies that episcopacy prevailed in the fourth century. But if Calvin thought that it was a corruption, and a sprout of popery, as you represent it, he never would have taken that age for his standard of excellence. It is, then, a reasonable inference, from these two passages, that Calvin preferred parity to prelacy.

This epistle was written to Cardinal Sadolet, in 1539, and was dated at Strasburgh, where Melancthon, Bucer, and a number of learned men were convened. The Emperor, for the purpose of composing the disputes between the contending parties, directed that conferences should be held at Worms and Ratisbon. The learned men sent by the Protestants took Calvin with them. Among the Articles which they drew up in order to effect a reconciliation with the Catholics, are the following.

"1. That all things might be done in the Church in an orderly manner, according to St. Paul's rule, &c. for the avoiding of schisms, there was a profitable ordinance, that a Bishop should

Digitized by Google

be chosen out of many Presbyters, who should rule the Church by teaching the Gospel, by retaining the discipline, *et qui præesset ipsis Presbyteris*—and who should govern the Presbyters themselves." *Art. Protest.* cap. *de Unit. Ecclesiæ.*

2. In addition to this, it is said, "As concerning ordination, we especially approve the ancient custom of the Church, that those who are to be ordained should first be tried, and instructed, and then admitted into the Ministry. This difficult and necessary charge, it is to be wished the Bishops would take upon them. And we hear, that our learned men have expressly yielded ordination to those Bishops, if there may be a reformation." *Res. Prot.*

3. In another tract that was composed by Bucer, with the advice of those learned men, and presented to the Emperor, it is thus written: "We must endeavour that the form and distribution of ecclesiastical government, which the canons prescribe to Bishops and Metropolitans, be restored and kept." And in the same tract—"Concerning names and titles, and all those things, wherewith that external power and dignity ought to be adorned and established, and the lawful obedience of such as be under them confirmed, it will be easily agreed upon." *De Reform. ad ver. Eccles.* p. 95.

Bucer has also given us his own particular opinion on this subject. When speaking of Bishops, and of their authority over the Churches and Ministers within their dioceses, he has these words—"This was agreeable to the law of CHRIST, and was done by the authority of the body of CHRIST." *De Vit. Minist.* p. 565.

Again: "By the perpetual observation of all Churches, even from the Apostles' times, we see, that *it seemed good to the* HOLY GHOST, that among Presbyters, to whom the procuration of Churches was chiefly committed, there should be one that should have the care or charge of divers Churches, and the whole ministry committed to him; and by reason of that charge he was above the rest; and, therefore, the name of Bishop was attributed peculiarly to those chief rulers." And this he proves by the example of St. James, Acts xv. and then concludes thus —"The like order has been observed perpetually in other Churches, as far as we may learn out of all the ecclesiastical histories, and the most ancient fathers, as Tertullian, Cyprian, Irenæus, Eusebius, and others." *De Cura Curat.* p. 251.

Heerbrandus, a learned divine of the Lutheran Church, says, "It were a most profitable order for the welfare of the Church, if every particular province had her Bishops, and the Bishops their Archbishop." *Loco de Eccles.* p. 699.

Jacobus Andreas is of the same opinion. He says, "It is a difficult matter to defend the peaceable estate of Churches, except there be some chief ruler and Bishop amongst them, to whom the full ordering of matters may be referred. *Ep. contra Min. Heidelberg.* p. 9.

Digitized by Google

To the same purpose Osiander writes—"Although in the primitive Church, when she flourished with miracles, there were divers degrees and orders of Ministers; some Apostles, some Prophets, some Evangelists, and some Pastors and Doctors; yet as now the state of the Church is, the Ministers may be divided into three orders, or degrees, viz. Deacons, Pastors, and Superintendents, &c. To the Pastors particular Churches are committed; and it is not doubted but that every one of them may rule the Church committed to him, without the council of any fellows. Those Pastors we call Superintendents, who are set over other Pastors, that they may visit the state of their Churches, and punish both Pastors and people, if any thing be done amiss; or if any thing fall out that they cannot correct, then they refer to a higher court," &c. *Loc. Comm.* Chap. x.

Hemingius also affirms, that "there are grades in the ministry, and that partly by the law of God, and partly by the approbation of the Church; that as Christ ascending into heaven gave gifts unto men—Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists, Doctors, and Pastors; so he gave to the Church authority for edification; that the Church, by virtue of that power, ordained Ministers for her profit; that the purer Churches following the Apostles' times, ordained some Patriarchs, some Bishops, &c.—that the reformed Churches have their Bishops, Doctors, Pastors," &c. *Institut. de Guber. Eccles.*

Hombergus also says, that "God himself hath appointed degrees of Ministers in the Church, even among those which have a mediate call, that concord among Ministers might be preserved, and the works of their ministry be more easy and more decent." And after specifying the common duties of Bishops and Ministers, he sets down those which are peculiar to Bishops, viz. Excommunication, Ordination, and Confirmation. *De Ministerio.*

With him agrees Haylbronner. Writing upon the epistle to Timothy, he shows that the Apostle appointed him Bishop of Ephesus; that, accordingly, "there are and ought to be degrees and orders of Ministers in the Church." And, having described the common duties of all Ministers, he says, "Besides the common offices, to Bishops was committed the public oversight and government; so as to belong to them to appoint fit Ministers for the Churches near them; as also to hear the accusations and complaints which are made against the Pastors of their Churches, and to decide them, &c. For so Paul writes to the Bishop of Ephesus, *Lay thy hands suddenly on no man, and against an Elder receive not an accusation*, &c." *De Minist. Eccles.*

Of the same judgment is Egidius Hunius, Divinity Professor at Marpurg, in his *Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to Titus.* He says, that "the Apostle appointed Titus the general Superintendent of the Churches of Crete—that his duty was to ordain Pastors in every parish, and likewise to make Bishops: that thereby it appeareth, that God doth require that there should be orders and degrees of Ministers, *ut alii præsint, alii subsint*—

Digitized by Google

that some may rule, and some obey: that this order is not newly devised, but received in the Church from the Apostles' times; and that God himself made a distinction between Ministers, and appointed degrees," &c. Again he says, "The word Bishop, notwithstanding it is often times used by St. Paul for every Pastor of the Church of God, who have a kind of oversight of their several charges, and so may *suo modo*—after a sort, be called Bishops or Superintendents, yet here (on the text—*a Bishop must be unreproveable*, &c.) it signifieth, by way of excellence, those *chief pastors*, to whom the oversight of the lives and manners of the other Ministers is committed."[y]

Numerous other passages might be produced from Lutheran and Calvinistic divines, to the same purpose. But I shall add no more. Enough has been quoted to prove, that the most learned men of those persuasions held that the Apostles instituted prelacy in the Church, and that it was universally the government down to the reformation. And the reason they give is the best that can possibly be given, namely, that it is best calculated to prevent schism, and to promote peace and good order, lest, as Calvin speaks, "ex æqualitate, ut fieri solet, dissidia nascerentur;" lest from equality, as it usually happens, dissensions should arise."[z] If Calvin afterwards altered his opinion with respect to the apostolic institution of prelacy, it is an instance of that influence which situation and circumstances have over the human mind; and therefore can have no weight in the great controversy between us. The reason which he gives for prelacy ever did, and ever will exist; and although *he* may have been inconsistent, *truth*, like its great author, must ever be unchangeable, ever the same.

What gives Luther, and Calvin, and some others, an appearance of inconsistency on this subject, is, that they do not generally explain the kind of imparity which they maintain. Hence it is, that they sometimes appear to be perfect equality men; at other times, to assert as strongly as possible inequality. But this is easily explained. They did not hold an inequality of *order*, but an inequality of *degree*. This opinion, the offspring of the "dregs of Popery," preserves them from self-contradiction; and in no other way can it be done. When Calvin declares that there was no equality in the primitive Church, and says, the reason was, to prevent dissensions; when he says, that the Bishop among his Presbyters, was as the Roman Consuls among the Senators; when he makes the Church in the fourth century, when all acknowledge it was episcopal, the standard of purity and excellence; when he censures, in severe terms, the Papists for departing from the purity of the Church in the age of Cyprian, and speaks of him and others as distinguished prelates; when such passages as these occur, it is impossible to suppose

y For all these quotations, see Bancroft's *Survey*, from p. 110 to p. 121.
z *Instit.* Lib. IV. sect. 2.

Digitized by Google

that he meant to assert the doctrine of equality. But, on the other hand, it is impossible, from several passages in his writings, to suppose that he held an inequality of order. The only possible way, therefore, to keep him clear of contradiction, is to ascribe to him the opinion already mentioned. The same observations are applicable to Luther, with this additional evidence of their correctness, that he, in fact, did establish a prelacy in Germany; not, indeed, on the ground of a divine right which destroys the validity of other ordinations; but on the ground of apostolical usage, for the sake of unity, and the prevention of those mischiefs which are the natural fruit of schism.

I believe that I have now given a correct view of this part of the controversy, and shall, therefore, say nothing more about it. After all, this is but a poor way to settle a point of fact; nor should I have had recourse to it, had not you filled several pages of your book with testimonies from German, Dutch, and Genevan divines. Neither your testimonies nor mine, have the weight of a feather in the scale of evidence; for, on both sides, they are nothing but *opinion*, and opinion can never determine a matter of fact. We have both had recourse to the only proper evidence, Scripture and the primitive fathers; and if I do not deceive myself, on these grounds you are completely defeated.

A few words with respect to Calvin's ordination and character.

If you will attend to what I said in my fifteenth Letter about Calvin's ordination, you will perceive that I did not speak of it as a matter beyond a doubt, that he never was ordained. I expressly declare, that 'it is very uncertain whether he received even Presbyterian ordination.' This necessarily implies that I was not satisfied either one way or the other. And yet, from reading your Seventh Letter, every one would be led to suppose, that I had positively asserted, that Calvin never was ordained. I mentioned it as a matter of doubt; as a point in which I wanted information. And to show you on what authority I doubted, I quoted Dr. Leaming and Mr. Reeves. The former, you say, was 'an ignorant or dishonest guide.' This is neither decent nor true. He was not either; but a respectable, pious, and well-informed man. This I know from a long and intimate acquaintance with him. He may have been mistaken; but if mistakes are marks of ignorance or dishonesty, what is to become of you and me? More decorum would have become you when speaking of a faithful Minister of CHRIST, who is now, I have no doubt, enjoying the fruit of his pious labonrs.—This to departed merit.

To return. What you quote from Beza with respect to Calvin's ordination, if it stood alone, would not be satisfactory. For the word 'designatus' does not determine whether Beza speaks of *ordination* or *installation*. The whole passage ought to have been quoted to enable us to determine precisely. But I acknowledge that my doubt is removed by the testimonies of Bellarmine and Junius, and by the probabilities you have stated. I have, therefore, no further opposition to make.

Digitized by Google

With respect to Calvin's character, I freely acknowledged that he was a man of talents, learning, and zeal; but at the same time asserted, that he was arbitrary and tyrannical. This I still assert, and were it necessary, or in any degree useful, would fill several pages with decisive proofs of my correctness. But no good can come of it: nor should I ever have mentioned it, were it not to show that presbytery admits (to say the least) of as much tyranny as episcopacy. Had you not so liberally bespattered prelates, Calvin's temper and conduct would never have been brought to view by me. Still, however, notwithstanding the provocation you gave me, it would have been more prudent to have said nothing about him, in this respect. I do not, therefore, feel the least reluctance in acknowledging my regret, that I followed the *bad example* you set me.

It certainly would afford me great pleasure, if every stain on the character of Calvin could be completely wiped away. But, sorry I am to say, this cannot be done. We may palliate his misconduct from the prevailing temper and notions of the age; but to justify it, would be a task which no man in his senses would undertake.

One more particular with respect to Calvin. You say, that Mr. How and myself make that reformer the father of Presbyterian parity; but that we are incorrect, as the Church of Geneva was governed by a presbytery before Calvin set his foot in that city. It is really a matter of very little consequence, whether Presbyterianism began two or three years sooner or later. We may both be right, according to the view we take of the subject. That Church was under the direction of the magistrates and two or three of the reforming Ministers, who remained after the Popish Bishop and Clergy had fled, to avoid the fury of the mob. It was utterly impossible to have any other but a temporary government, during the short interval between the flight of the Bishop and the arrival of Calvin; and that government was necessarily in its leading feature Presbyterian. On Calvin's arrival, he was admitted one of their preachers, and a divinity reader. Not pleased with the state of things, he drew up a system of Church government, and presented it to the people to be received under the obligation of an oath. The people were dissatisfied with it; disturbance arose, and Calvin was banished. It was not long, however, that he continued in exile. He was soon recalled, and then he established his system, with some slight alterations. So that, in fact, Presbyterianism was not a regular system, and fully established, till Calvin's return from banishment. This is the grand epoch of that system; although, in a certain qualified sense, it existed in Geneva a few months sooner. This is a correct view of the subject, as you will find by consulting Mosheim and Hooker. And, indeed, it agrees pretty much with your own account of the matter. Mr. How and myself, therefore, are substantially correct.

A few words with respect to the doctrines of Calvin. You

Digitized by Google

say,[a] 'Dr. B. and Mr. How both throw out many reflections on that system of doctrine which is generally called Calvinism. The latter, in particular, speaks of it as a detestable system, of which he has no language adequately to express his abhorrence. It was my original intention to devote a whole letter to the consideration of this greatly misunderstood and abused system of truth.'

Now, Sir, in looking over my letters, I cannot find that I have said a word against Calvin's doctrinal opinions; but as you are frequently most grossly off your guard when you tell your readers what I have said, or have not said, it can create no surprise in me, or in any body else, that the beginning, middle, and end of your last work should, in this respect, be all of a piece. But this by the way.

As to Mr. How, he will answer for himself, and, no doubt, to the purpose. As your observation respects me, I now say what I did not in any page of my letters addressed to you. Personal, unconditional election, with its unavoidable counterpart, personal, unconditional reprobation, I, with Mr. How, hold in the utmost abhorrence; nor can I ever think of some of Calvin's positions without shuddering. The following is one of them. "As God has his effectual call whereby he gives the *elect* the salvation to which he has ordained them; so has he his judgments towards the *reprobates*, whereby he executes his decree concerning them. As many, therefore, as he created to live miserably, and then perish everlastingly, these, that they may be brought to the end for which they were created, he sometimes deprives of the possibility of hearing the word, and at other times, by preaching thereof, blinds and stupifies them the more."[b] This, and many other such passages in the writings of Calvin, make my blood run cold. I never can think of the greater part of the human race being brought into existence under a decree of damnation, without the strongest feeling of indignation against the man who could pen such a sentence. What a picture of a gracious and merciful God!—But I am done. The subject always lacerates my feelings.

You have asserted that the Church of England is Calvinistic in her doctrines, and that her reformers were Calvinists. You certainly must be unacquainted with the writings of many of her ablest divines, who have proved these assertions to be totally groundless. Had you read Tucker, Randolph, Daubeny, Pearson, Winchester, Laurence, Pretyman, and others, who have written upon the subject, you never would have ventured such assertions. That several eminent divines of her communion have been Calvinists, is beyond a doubt, as several have been Arians; but the great body of her clergy, ever since the reformation, and particularly since the reign of Elizabeth, have been on the

a *Continuation*, p. 329. [p. 420, 2d *ed.*]
b *Institut.* B. III. chap. xxiv. sect. 21.

Digitized by Google

Arminian side of this controversy; and in this country, I doubt whether there are three clergymen of our Church, who believe the doctrine of individual election and reprobation.

There are certain doctrines found in our articles and offices which ought not to be called Calvinistic, as they are are not peculiar to Calvinism, but are common to almost all denominations of Christians. Those doctrines are, the depravity of human nature, the necessity of the renewal of the mind by divine influence, salvation by the merit of CHRIST's atonement considered as a strict and proper sacrifice, a trinity of persons in the unity of the Godhead, the necessity of holiness and obedience springing from evangelical faith, the resurrection of the body, a general judgment, eternal happiness to the righteous, and eternal misery to the wicked. These are the doctrines which our Church constantly inculcates; but never does she teach the doctrines of absolute electiou and reprobation; of irresistible grace and final perseverance. She uses, indeed, the words election and predestination; but it would be the excess of weakness thence to infer that she is Calvinistic. Her doctrines are most unequivocally general redemption, and the defectibility of divine grace; and if these are not the doctrines of holy Scripture, it will be hard to reconcile it with itself, with the attributes of the Deity, and with the common sense of mankind. But this is a controversy into which I am not disposed to enter at present—Mr. How will probably occupy some pages with it.

There is one more particular on which I wish to say a few words, before I examine the contents of your two last letters. What I have reference to, is the government of the Church in the kingdoms of Sweden and Denmark. You deny that they are episcopal; but at the same time acknowledge, that there is a gradation of Ministers among them. This, however, you assert, rests on the ground of human prudence, and, consequently, they lay no claim to apostolic sanction. For this you quote Dr. Colin, Pastor of the Swedish Church in Philadelphia. But still I must adhere to Mosheim, and to his translator, Dr. Maclaine, who, you know, was a Presbyterian, and yet asserts that the Churches of those northern kingdoms are different from the Churches in Germany; the former being episcopal, the latter neither episcopal nor presbyterian.[c] Here then the matter must rest, and the reader must judge for himself.

---

c *Eccles. Hist.* Vol. IV. p. 287.

Digitized by Google

LETTER XIV.

REV. SIR:

HAVING given what I deem a sufficient reply to every thing of the least consequence in your first eight letters, and there being nothing material in the ninth, I proceed to try the strength of your tenth Letter.

I find you still maintain that episcopacy was gradually introduced after the apostolic age; and you suppose the causes were, 'the facility, the indolence, and the consideration of some; the ambition of others; the precedency of standing moderators; the veneration paid to senior ministers, and such as were of superior talents and influence; the respect attached to those who resided in large cities, and other considerations of a similar kind.'

Next, you present your readers with a long quotation from my eighteenth Letter, and you represent me as saying that there was not a single instance of clerical ambition, or of strife about pre-eminence, or of ecclesiastical usurpation in those early ages. This is one of the grossest of your many perversions of my meaning, when not a shadow of ambiguity attends it. Do you suppose that I am an idiot, or that I am totally ignorant of human nature, or that I have never read the New Testament, or any ecclesiastical historian? No strife about pre-eminence! Had I not mentioned the strife of the Apostles, and the case of Diotrephes, and of Thebuthis, in the first century? Nay, did I not mention the very instances which you have named for the purpose of covering me 'with confusion?' Did I not give a long list of heresies, schisms, and corruptions in the first three centuries? Sir, you either did, or did not, know what I had said. If you *did* know, you have acted contrary to your own conviction; if you did *not* know, you ought to be ashamed to answer an opponent when you were ignorant of what he had said. Can you excuse yourself by saying that my expressions are obscure? They are as clear as the light of heaven. No mortal besides yourself would suppose, that I meant to convey any other ideas, but that the Church for the first three centuries was in a *comparatively* pure state; that her Bishops and other Clergy were *generally* virtuous and pious; that every thing was calculated to make them so, if a scanty support, cruel persecutions, dreadful deaths, constant labours, and rigid discipline, have that tendency. Now, how contemptible must that reasoning be, which attempts to invalidate those notorious facts, by producing a few instances of strife and affectation of pre-eminence, and several of these too among profligate heretics, who were renounced and execrated by the Catholic Church? Several of the very instances you have adduced are the strongest proofs you could possibly have given of the purity of the

Digitized by Google

Church. Were Simon, and Cerinthus, and Basilides, and Valentinus, and some others, considered as Christians? You know they were not. Why then, in the name of candour and fair dealing, do you quote such instances of corruption, when those men and their followers did not belong to the Church? You might just as well have told us that the priests of Jupiter, and of the other Heathen gods, were corrupt, and thence have inferred the corruption of the Christian Church; and to give *force* and *decision* to the argument, it should be concluded with, 'this is more than sufficient, if I do not mistake, to cover Dr. B. with confusion.'

I really do not know any man whose writings afford so many examples, in so short a compass, of the justness of those canons of criticism, which are annexed to White's *Defence of his Letters to a Dissenting Gentleman.* The second canon runs thus—"Consider what end you write for. If it be the discovery and manifestation of truth, and the conviction of those who oppose it, use fair and clear reasoning; but if it be only to keep your party in countenance, your business will be to decline reasoning as much as you well can, and to make use of declamation and harangue in the room of it."

To prove that there was some strife for pre-eminence in the Church at an early period, you quote a passage from Hermas. Why you have quoted him I cannot conceive, unless it be to fill your book, and give your opponents trouble. You might have produced instances enough from the New Testament. But the beauty of your quotation from Hermas is, that it does you no good. Whether he lived in the first, or in the second century, is a matter of dispute among both ancients and moderns. It is, however, of no consequence. What he says is this—"Those who had their rods green, but yet cleft, are such as were always faithful and good; but they had some *envy* and *strife* among themselves concerning *dignity* and *pre-eminence*." Again: "For the life of those who keep the commandments of the LORD consists in doing what they are commanded; not in *principality*, or in any other *dignity*." It seems then, in the time of Hermas, whenever that was, there were some good men who affected pre-eminence. No doubt of it; for there never was a moment, from the fall of man to the present day, that the same may not be said. And this, according to Hermas, and according to common sense, is consistent with piety and goodness. If it be not, GOD be merciful to Dr. Miller, and a thousand other Doctors of Divinity! But who were those that affected dignity? Hermas does not say whether they were laymen who affected clerical distinction, or Deacons who affected an equality with, or a superiority over Presbyters, as in the time of Jerome, or Presbyters who strove to be Bishops. If the last, then there was such a pre-eminent station in the Church as that of Bishop; or it was the first attempt that was made to establish that office; and as the attempt failed, (which you must admit on your own hypothesis) it proves the Church to have been in great purity.

Digitized by Google

Further: How could Hermas say, that those were good men who endeavoured to subvert the government of the Church, which, you say, was left by the Apostles on the ground of parity? Good men may desire dignities already established; but to destroy the constitution of either Church or State, for the purpose of aggrandizing one's self, is utterly inconsistent with goodness, nay, argues a monstrous degree of depravity.

Another curiosity is, your quoting the case of Thebuthis, who strove to be Bishop of Jerusalem, after the death of St. James, but was rejected by that pure and faithful Church. Then, it seems, St. James was Bishop of Jerusalem, where there were numerous congregations, and numerous Presbyters. 'Oh yes —he was Moderator of the Presbytery.' For life, or by rotation? If the latter, how came he to be styled Bishop of Jerusalem more than any other Moderator? If the former, in what did his superiority consist? What is the superiority of a *chairman* to induce any man to struggle for it? What *dignity* is there in collecting votes, and keeping order? In short, it would be a total waste of time to notice such things, were it not to show that your own evidence strongly militates against you.

You still go on labouring to prove, not that the government of the Church was, in fact, changed from presbyterian to episcopal, but that the corruption in the third century was so great as very well to admit of a change. Here is another instance of evasion, in perfect conformity with the sixth of those canons already referred to. It runs thus—"If you cannot defend the true point in question, change it, and slip in another, which you can better defend in the room of it." This you have done completely. My reasoning was founded, not on the state of the Church in the *third* and *fourth* centuries, but in the *second* century. I had previously quoted a number of your ablest writers, as conceding that episcopacy originated about the middle of the second century, and had also quoted the whole assembly of your own Westminster divines, approving of Blondel's opinion, that the proper date was about the year 140. Here I took my stand, and showed with a force of reasoning, to my mind, scarce resistible, that so great a revolution was utterly inconsistent with the universally acknowledged fact that the Church, at that time, was in a state of great purity. This you yourself acknowledge to be the case; and, therefore, I must think, that, feeling the force of the reasoning, you found it necessary to shift your ground. This most of your readers will not perceive; and consequently, you will have the appearance of a victory, when you are, in fact, defeated.

Your quotations, then, from three or four authors in the third and fourth centuries, are of no manner of service to you. Let the Church be as corrupt as you would have it in the *third* century, surely it requires very little intellect to perceive, that this has nothing to do with the point in question. The question was, whether a change could have taken place in the *second* century, when your greatest writers and yourself acknowledge, that the

Digitized by Google

Church was in a state of purity. This, I think, was fully proved to be a weak question.

But, Sir, I will take you on your own ground. You shall have your humour. The Church *was* corrupt in the third century. The inference, then, is, 'a change took place from presbyterian to episcopal government.' But here a long string of difficulties attend you.

1. Every author of that age asserts, that episcopacy was an apostolic institution. This has been proved by overwhelming evidence.

2. Not one author of that age has given the most distant hint that a change took place. You have not produced a single syllable to that purpose. How came you then by the knowledge of it?

3. Almost every Bishop, at that time, was a man of great piety, and many of them were martyrs to the religion of CHRIST. They, therefore, could not have been the authors of so wicked a change.

4. The third century was an age of much ecclesiastical business. Several points of discipline were warmly discussed; but not the least question about episcopacy. There certainly must have been a few honest men to bear testimony against such an anti-christian usurpation. No; all were silent as the grave.

5. If the generality of the clergy were corrupt, corruption would have produced a conflict of a very serious nature. The corrupt *many* would have overwhelmed the corrupt *few*, as these had not the secular arm to support them. What stirred up the Bishops to struggle for pre-eminence would have stirred up the Presbyters also, who were much more numerous. You are supposing corruption all on one side, and yet you tell us that it was pretty general among all ranks. What an absurdity! Dr. Campbell saw this, and therefore ascribes episcopacy to superior piety. *Risum, amici, teneatis?* [Friends, can you forbear laughing?]

6. Where did the conflict begin? Or did it break out all at once throughout Europe, Asia, and Africa? And how happened it that not a single Church was preserved from the contagion? It must have spread with greater velocity than a tempest, tearing up parity by the roots, and leaving nothing behind it but sterile episcopacy.

7. You confound two distinct things—a struggle for the episcopate after it had been long established, and a struggle whether it should be established, and parity destroyed. The former occurred in a few instances, the love of pre-eminence getting the better of every other consideration. This was very natural, and can be accounted for on well known principles; but the latter counteracts every principle of human nature; and from the well known circumstances of the age, could not have succeeded had the attempt been made. Let some of your ambitious men make the attempt now, and see whether they could succeed. The

Digitized by Google

virtue and piety of your Ministers and people, are not greater than the virtue and piety of the primitive Christians. The most extensive charity must allow, that there is corruption enough among you to stir up strife for pre-eminence, if there was the least possibility of succeeding. But with what contempt would such an effort be treated! It would excite nothing but ridicule or indignation; no serious exertion of strength would be thought of; but the scheme, by its own folly, would terminate in the failure and disgrace of the projectors. Nor would it pass away without notice in the history of the Church. Whenever the Presbyterian denomination was the subject, this foul blot on its purity would be strikingly visible. These observations apply with much greater force to the Christians of the third century. Living so near the fountain head, they could be at no loss for the source of *parity*, if that prevailed. The stream was too wide to admit of the least difficulty in tracing it back one hundred and fifty years. Convinced that parity was of divine institution, both clergy and people would have suffered for it rather than have renounced it; or if they had become so profligate as to care nothing about the doctrine and government of the Church, the clergy, in particular, would at least have cared for their own degraded situation. Pride would have struggled hard, had even piety been extinguished; and some notice of the struggle would have reached our time most assuredly.

It is a well known fact, that great corruptions in Church or State produce great changes. There is no need of proving this; history is full of it. But who can substantiate a charge of general corruption in the third century? And if it could be done, how happened it that all Churches stumbled on episcopacy? Where there is such a variety of modes of government, it would be a miracle to produce the same result in every Church. Some would prefer a democracy in the Church, some an aristocracy; some one species of monarchy, and some another; many would run into a mixture of every kind, and many, weary with contention, would re-settle in the old simple *parity*. This would be the natural and unavoidable course of things; but as we see nothing like it in the third century, we may be sure the change which your fancy delights to dwell on never took place.

Corruption, then, were it tenfold greater than you wish to make it, will not answer your purpose, but rather increases the difficulties attending your hypothesis. It is, if there be any choice between them, worse than Dr. Campbell's conjecture. With him I have nothing to do; but as you take directly opposite ground, it is worth while to notice it, as it shows the sad embarrassment of the advocates of your beloved parity.

But although my argument is safe enough without maintaining the purity of the Church in the third century, yet, as truth is worth contending for, I shall endeavour to show that you are grossly mistaken in your ideas on this subject.

You first quote St. Cyprian deploring the mal-conduct of

Digitized by Google

divers Bishops, who neglected their high trust, and were intent on their own secular pursuits, instead of devoting themselves to the care of their flocks, and the promotion of piety in themselves and others. He also laments the degeneracy of some of the other orders of the clergy, and many of the laity. This is a lamentable fact. But still the great body of the clergy and laity were stedfast in the faith, and ornaments to the religion which they professed. Converts to Christianity had multiplied to a prodigious degree. We may, therefore, reasonably suppose, that there was an increase of corrupt members iu the Church of that age; but there would also be an increase of pure and worthy Christians. This great increase of converts, rationally accounts for a greater degree of corruption in the third, than in the second century. The clergy, also, in consequence of this great accession of numbers, were exceedingly multiplied; and, consequently, there would be a greater number of deviations among that order from a strict and holy life, than in the second century. Still, on comparison, in this respect there might have been, and probably was, as much virtue and piety in the one age in the other. There was no change of circumstances in the Church to induce us to suppose that it was otherwise. Persecution still continued as hot and as fierce as ever. This has a powerful tendency to purify both priests and people. The discipline of the Church also was very strict; much more so than I believe is to be found in any Church upon earth in our day. The revenues of the Church, too, arose as in the former age, from the voluntary offerings of the people, and were divided, as usual, among the clergy and the poor. It is true, the offerings were put into the hands of the Bishop for distribution; but "to avoid suspicion and prevent mismanagement, he was obliged to give an account of his administration in a provincial synod; as also at his election to exhibit a list of his own goods and estate, that such things as belonged to him might be distinguished from those that belonged to God and the Church."[d] There were also in that age regular provincial councils, in which doctrines were discussed, and excellent canons enacted. Heresies were cried down, schisms were marked with general disapprobation, and vice, both in clergy and people, was severely punished. These circumstances, which no one can deny, afford a strong argument *a priori*, that the Church would be pure. And, *in fact*, we find it was generally so, notwithstanding the complaints of Origen, Cyprian, and Eusebius, of many instances of depravity. Amidst millions of professing Christians, thousands of Bishops, and tens of thousands of Presbyters and Deacons, who would not look for many instances of unchristian living? But all this while, the great body of the clergy and people were sound in doctrine and holy in life. The crowds of martyrs in that age throughout the Roman empire, go a great way to establish the fact. Numerous are the

d BINGHAM'S *Antiquities*, Vol. II. p. 285, 8vo.

Digitized by Google

testimonies which might be produced. Origen, whom you quote as lamenting the increase of vice, bears his testimony to the virtues of the clergy. He represents them as "traversing every corner of the world, and making converts to godliness, both in cities and villages; and that they were so far from making a gain thereof, that many of them took nothing for their service; and those that did, took only what was necessary for their present subsistence."[e] The writings of Cyprian, who was a severe censor of the manners of Christians, bear ample testimony to the virtues of the Bishops and clergy in Africa; and Eusebius, in his history of the Church in the third century, bears a similar testimony. In the fourth, there was a considerable falling off, as was to be expected when the Church was freed from persecution, and basking in the sunshine of royal favour. But still the great body of the clergy were pure, as appears from the testimony of both friends and foes. Julian, the apostate, in his letter to Arsacius, High Priest of Galatia, (as recorded by Sozomen[f]) tells him that the cause of the increase of Christianity was the holy lives of Christians; and, therefore he charges him to take care that the priests under him live according to their character. Ammianus Marcellinus, another Heathen writer, commends the virtues of the Christian Bishops in the same age.[g] St. Austin gives an excellent character of the Bishops and clergy of his own time (the fourth century.) "He makes them the chief ornament of the Catholic Church, and extols their virtues above those of a monastic life."[h] Lactantius bears the same testimony; so does Gregory Nazianzen. Tertullian, also, in the third century, speaks the same language; and they all triumph over the Heathen philosophers on this ground in particular, which would argue impudence or stupidity, if the fact were not notorious.

Nothing can be more deceptive than your manner of treating this subject. The question simply is, Did episcopacy take its rise in the third century? Instead of proving that it actually *did*, you endeavour to show, that there was so much corruption in the Church at that time, as *to admit* of its taking place. Supposing that you had proved this, what would you gain by it? Surely it does not follow that it *did* take place. After I had given you abundance of proof, that episcopacy was universally the regimen of the Church, your proving the moral possibility of a change from parity to imparity contributes nothing to your view. Still my proofs are a dead weight upon you, which you have not so much as attempted to remove.

In answer to my observation, that if episcopacy was a human invention, we should be able to name the century in which it made its appearance; you say that we do not know the century in which Metropolitans originated; and this, you maintain, is a set off to the difficulty I suggested with respect to episcopacy,

---

e BINGHAM, Vol. II. p. 294.
f Lib. V. c. 16.
g BINGHAM, Vol. II. p. 294.
h *Ibid.*

Digitized by Google

To this I replied, we *do* know the century in which Metropolitans originated; but if we did not, it is nothing to the purpose, as there is no parallel between the cases.

I do not see that you have said any thing to my observations on this point worth mentioning. You set aside Cave's testimony because he wrote in the eighteenth century. Bingham's is treated as cavalierly. But you forgot that this writer gives you *fact* for the existence of Metropolitans, or *primi inter pares*, in the second century; and as we have no evidence that they existed in the first, the consequence is, that they began in the second. This is the opinion of Mosheim also. He says, the effect of councils was "the gradual abolition of that perfect equality which reigned among all Bishops in the primitive times. For the order and decency of these assemblies required, that some one of the provincial Bishops met in council should be invested with a superior degree of power and authority; and hence the rights of the Metropolitans derive their origin." And he observes, that "before the middle of the second century, there is not the least trace of councils."[i] This appears to me to be proof sufficient, that Metropolitans, under different names, originated in the second century; but you think that I am 'contented with very slender proof,' and that my account is ludicrous. I believe it would puzzle any one but a man of your keen penetration, and delicate sensibility, to discover any thing ludicrous in it, whatever else he may discover. I give pretty clear evidence that Metropolitans began in the second century; but you do not give the least proof that episcopacy began in the second or third century. You appear to be afraid to commit yourself on this point. All you can discover is a 'kind of imparity' in the third century. Here, then, is a material difference between the two cases.

Further: You want me to show *how* Metropolitans were introduced, and by what means, and whether with or without *opposition*. These were sufficiently shown in my eighteenth Letter. The councils which began to meet about the middle of the second century, would necessarily prove the foundation of a primacy; and what naturally resulted from the meetings of numerous Bishops, could meet with no opposition.

But were the origin of Metropolitans involved in midnight darkness, there would be no parallel between the two cases. To this you reply thus: 'Why no parallel? The office of Metropolitan was a grade of ecclesiastical pre-eminence, as well as that of ordinary Bishop. Now, if it be granted, that the former office was introduced by human contrivance; that it was gradually brought in; that it was introduced without any known opposition and noise; why might not the same facts have occurred with respect to prelacy?' Because the supposition would be too unreasonable to be admitted. Provincial councils would neces-

i *Eccles. Hist.* Vol. I. p. 178, 179.

Digitized by Google

sarily choose a president for the sake of order; and the choice would naturally fall, *cæteris paribus*, [circumstances in other respects being the same] either on the Bishop of the metropolis, or on the oldest Bishop. The latter was the general practice in Africa, and accordingly the Primates in that country, were frequently styled *patres* [fathers,] and *senes* [elders.] But the first was the practice in most other parts, and the titles also were different in different places. Now, these reasons operating to produce repeated elections of the Bishop of the metropolis, or of the senior Bishop, would naturally produce a fixed presidency by common consent; and in the council of Nice the whole was subjected to ecclesiastical law by the Bishops themselves. Thus it is evident, that from first to last, the Bishops of the province were at the bottom of the primacy, and of every thing relating to it. There was no usurpation; no rights were wrested from the Bishops, but every thing was freely granted. This was the natural course of things; and, so far as we have records, they confirm these particulars.

Now consider the course of episcopacy on your hypothesis. At first, towards the close of the apostolic age, *Moderators* were chosen by the Presbyters for the sake of order. This you represent as a *temporary* Moderatorship; but, according to Blondel, and many others, a Presidency *for life*, by apostolic example. Your disagreement, however, on this point, is nothing to me. But what next? Why, all at once, we see this Moderator, who, as such, had no relation whatever to the Church, styled Bishop *of the Church*, or Bishop *of the city* where he lived. We see him claiming the *obedience* of the Presbyters in spiritual things, and this both *in* and *out* of the Presbytery. We see him claiming the *supreme power* of the keys, the right of ordaining, and a negative power in the whole jurisdiction of the Church; and this we find to be the case every where at a very early period, and no complaint was made against it, nor any hint given that it was either a usurpation, or that the Church conferred these powers for the purpose of creating a higher order of ecclesiastics. Now is this any thing like the case of Metropolitans? The mind which cannot see such striking traits of disparity, must be either incurably prejudiced, or subject to a strange oliquity of thinking.

Every document which we possess on the subject of Metropolitical distinction implies, that the distinction was founded on common consent; nor have you produced one syllable to the contrary. But with respect to episcopacy, all the testimonies that I have produced (and they are very abundant) either expressly declare, or necessarily imply, that episcopacy is an apostolic institution. Such is the immense distance between your misnamed parallel cases.

The next point which you retouch is, the question when Christianity was introduced into Scotland. *You* pitch upon the beginning of the third century; *I* upon the beginning of the fifth;

Digitized by Google

and you pronounce that I follow blind guides in what I have said. If such men as Usher, Lloyd, and Stillingfleet, are blind guides on a point of antiquity, I believe we shall be very much at a loss for luminous guides. But if these will not do, you shall have more. Let us first, however, attend to what you say.

Your first testimony to prove that you are right, is a passage from Tertullian. He says, "The places of Britain to which the Romans could have no access are, notwithstanding, subject to CHRIST." This was written, probably, in the early part of the third century.

To this Stillingfleet thus replies. "This proves that Christianity was then received beyond the wall, but not by the Scots, who were not yet settled in those parts; but by the old Britains, who were driven thither, as appears by the account given by Xiphilin out of Dio, who saith, that the Britains were divided into two sorts, the Mætæ and the Caledonii. The former dwelt by the wall, and the latter beyond them. These were the extra provincial Britains, and were distinct both from the Picts and Scots, saith John Fordon, who carefully distinguishes these three nations, when he speaks of their wars with the Romans."[k]

Stillingfleet also quotes the Scotch historian, Dempster, asserting, that "there were no Christians in Scotland before Palladius, but such as fled thither out of Britain because of persecution."[l] —Tertullian's testimony, it is evident, will do you no good.

Your next testimony is from Fordon, the Monk, who lived twelve hundred years after the event, and quotes nobody. He says, "Before the coming of Palladius, the Scots, following the custom of the primitive Church, had teachers of the faith, and dispensers of the sacraments, who were only Presbyters or Monks."

"Fordon the Monk," says Bishop Lloyd, "seems to have had no more knowledge of antiquity than others had that lived in his age." The Bishop proves this by numerous instances, but particularly by showing that Monkery did not exist in the third century. Fordon's object undoubtedly was, to give it as high an origin as he well could.

"This dreaming Monk," says the Bishop, "was pleased to discover (for the honour of his order) that before the coming of Palladius, &c. (as quoted.) Now, there were no monks in the world at that time. Monkery began in the east, in the time of Dioclesian's persecution. (An. 303.) From thence it was long ere it came over into Europe, saith Sozomen. It was first brought to Rome by Athanasius, saith Baronius; that is, Athanasius first gave them at Rome the relation of St. Anthony, and of the other Egyptian Monks."[m]

---

k *Antiquities of the British Churches*, p. 33.—XIPHILIN, in *Severo.—Scotichron.* Lib. III.

l *Prof. Brit. Antiq.* p. 40.

m *Church Government in Scotland by Culdees*, p. 153, 154.

Digitized by Google

From Egypt Monkery was introduced into Italy, thence carried by St. Martin into France, when after he was made a Bishop, he founded a monastery near Tours.[n]

"From this plantation," says Lloyd, "no doubt it was that Monkery came over first into these Islands. Among the Scots (that is, *Irish*) we cannot doubt the first Monks were St. Martin's disciples, when we remember that his nephew, St. Patrick, was the apostle of that nation. Of which Patrick, we are told that his uncle gave him the Monk's habit. So Probus tells us in the life of St. Patrick, that he brought the Christian faith and monastic life into Ireland." From thence Columba brought it to the isle of Huy.

"I have carried," continues the Bishop, "the origin of these Monks as high as I possibly can when I fetch their origin from St. Martin, who died in the year 401. And yet, to make them begin so late in these islands, is enough to show that all that fabric of Church government by Culdees, hath no foundation in ancient history."[o]

The rise of Monkery is also very accurately noted by Mosheim. To avoid the fury of the Dioclesian persecution, a great many Christians, both male and female, fled into the deserts of Egypt. "Anthony," says he, "was the first who formed them into a regular body, and prescribed fixed rules for the direction of their conduct. From the east, this gloomy institution passed into the west, and first into Italy and its neighbouring islands. St. Martin, the celebrated Bishop of Tours, erected the first monasteries in Gaul. From hence, the monastic discipline extended gradually its progress through the other provinces and countries of Europe."[p]

Monkery, then, among Christians, having had no existence till the fourth century, and none in Ireland and Scotland till the fifth, it completely proves the ignorance or knavery of Fordon, in placing the introduction of Christianity into Scotland by Monks, as early as the first part of the third century.

Next comes John Major, the Sorbonist, who wrote in the sixteenth century, and faithfully followed Fordon. He also says, "Before the coming of Palladius hither, the Scots were taught by Priests and Monks without Bishops." "By saying *hither*," says Lloyd, "he meant into Scotland, where as yet there were no Scots inhabiting, and whither Palladius was not sent. But what was all this to Fordon or Major? One wrote what came into his head, and, for aught the other could tell, it might be true."[q]

Your next testimony is from Hector Boethius, who keeps close to his file leader John Fordon, but without so much as naming him or Major. He quotes, indeed, "Veremundus, who lived under Malcolm the third, in times of gross ignorance; so that,

n *Church Gov. in Scotland by Culdees*, p. 153, 154.
o *Ibid.* p. 156, 157.
p *Eccles. Hist.* Vol. I. p. 377, 378.
q *Ch. Gov.* p. 148, 149.

Digitized by Google

unless he could see the further for being so much in the dark, he could tell us little of things eight hundred years before his time."[r]

"The best is," continues Lloyd, "that Hector had no need of his (Veremundus') or any other testimony; for he could not only make stories, but authors too when he pleased. And why not, as well as make a Bishop of St. Alban's cloak? It was, indeed, our Jeoffrey of Monmouth that first turned the cloak into a man, and so prepared it for Hector's ordination. The word Amphibalus, which is Latin for a shag cloak, and was used in that sense in the legend of St. Alban, our Jeoffry had the luck to mistake for a proper name, and so joined this Amphibalus with St. Alban, as his fellow-martyr. Hector brings this Amphibalus into Scotland to king Crathlint, and there ordains *it*, first Bishop of the Isle of Man, and seats his Culdees there with him; so that belike they were the Dean and Chapter to St. Alban's cloak. This was Hector's own invention, unless any one can find it in Veremundus, whom he is pleased to quote for it. He tells us this happened at the time when Constantius, the father of Constantine, cruelly persecuted the Christians in Britain; who never persecuted them in his life, as all those writers say that lived with him."[s]

"To prove Hector Boethius a man of no credit is needless, when so many have done it to my hand, and, therefore, I forbear to show it in other instances."[t]

It having been proved that there were no Monks in the third century, Hector's story, like Fordon's, is the fruit of either ignorance or impudence.

Your next testimonies are from Prosper and Baronius. The first says, "Palladius is ordained by Pope Cœlestine for the Scots, who had already believed in CHRIST, and is sent to them to be their first Bishop." And Baronius says, "All men agree, that this nation (the Scots) had Palladius their first Bishop, from Pope Cœlestine."

Now, Sir, I will prove, by evidence incontrovertible, that by the Scots, Prosper means the Irish, and that Palladius never was Bishop to the *Albion* Scots. This, you say, is 'ridiculous.' Well, Sir, after I have produced my evidence, our readers will be able to appreciate your assertion, and to give it its proper name.

First, I assert that, in the third century, and long after, the people *called Scots* were the *Irish*.

"The first writer," says Bishop Lloyd, "that mentions the name of Scots, is Porphyry, in a book which seems to have been written about the year of CHRIST 300. There he speaks of the Scottish nations apart, as not living in Britain at that time. But that their dwelling then was in Ireland, is affirmed by Ovosius,

---

r LLOYD, p. 151.

s *Ch. Gov. p.* 151, 152.

t LLOYD'S *Ch. Gov.* and VOSSIUS *de Hist. Latinis.*

Digitized by Google

in his history, which was written in the year 417. His words are, 'Ireland is inhabited by the nations of the Scots.' With which agrees that of Claudian, who wrote about twenty years before, that 'the Scots rose all over Ireland, and made the seas foam with their oars.' And again, that 'Ireland wept over the heaps of Scots that were slain.' So Prosper, within twenty years after Orosius, calls that in which the Scots lived, the *barbarous Island*, in contradistinction to Britain, which he calls the *Roman Island*. Therefore, Ireland is called *Scotia* by the writers of those times; particularly by him that calls himself Hegesippus, who was either St. Ambrose, or a writer of that age. So Isidore, about the year 620, saith, '*Scotia* is the same with *Hibernia*.' Gildas, who wrote in the year 564, calls the same people sometimes *Scoti*, and sometimes *Hiberni*. Cogitosus saith of Kildare, in *Ireland*, 'that it was the safest place in all the lands of the *Scots*.' Adamnus, about the year 680, calls it the '*Isle of Scotland*,' and says of Columba, that 'he settled out of Scotland into Britain.' Bede, in his history, which was written about fifty years after, saith of the Scots, that 'their country is Ireland,' and sometimes calls it the *Isle of Scotland*. King Alfred, in his Saxon translation of Orosius, hath these words, '*Hibernia, that we call Scotland*;' and in his translation of Bede, he calls it sometimes *Hibernia Scotland*, and sometimes *Hibernia, the Scots' Island*. "Not to burthen the reader, I shall refer him," says Lloyd, "to the most learned Bishop Usher, who, at large, proves this use of the word, and thus concludes—'I do not believe that there is any writer that lived within a thousand years after CHRIST that once mentioneth the name of Scotland, and doth not mean Ireland by it.'"

Bishop Lloyd next proves, by the most convincing testimonies, that the Irish Scots did not settle in what is now called Scotland till towards the close of the fifth century; that they united with the Picts in several conflicts with the Saxons, and were several times driven by the Saxons across the channel; but that at length they made a permanent settlement in that country. For this, and all his testimonies, see the first and second chapters of his *Church Government in Britain*.

From this decisive evidence, it is clear that by the *Scots*, Prosper means the *Irish*, and that Palladius never was a Bishop to the *Albion Scots*. His success in Ireland was not great; therefore, St. Patrick, who converted a great part of the country, is considered as the Apostle and first Bishop of the Irish nation.[u]

---

u Since writing the above, the eighth Number of the Quarterly Review has been re-printed. In that masterly work I find CHALMER'S *Caledonia* reviewed, and spoken of in terms of high approbation. "We proceed," say they, "to our author's logical and convincing proofs that the Picts and Caledonians were merely tribes of the same people, and that towards the close of the fourth, and at the commencement of the fifth centuries, Ireland was the country of the Scots. This opinion, in which Mr. Chalmers is fortified by the authority of Camden, is thus made out.—'Claudian regarded Ireland as the country of the Scots at the commencement of the fifth age. A century and a half afterwards Gildas also mentioned Ireland as the proper coun-

Digitized by Google

Had you, Sir, looked over Lloyd, and Stillingfleet, and Usher, I cannot suppose that you would have meddled with this subject again. You certainly would have treated with contempt two or three legendary writers, who lived a thousand years after the events they record, and produce no authority for what they assert, but from men in the moon, or from tales of the cloister, fit only for children, or the ignorant and superstitious devotees of the middle ages. Learning is now a different thing from what it was then. Antiquities, in particular, have been greatly elucidated, and many points which were very obscure at that time, are now placed beyond controversy. Evidence is weighed in a more exact balance, and men of sense and learning will not be satisfied in historical points with any thing short of a reasonable degree of probability, and with authentic testimony.

How, Sir, you could have so far lost sight of propriety, as to call the three great prelates, on whom I depend for my information, 'blind guides,' is beyond my comprehension. And to call that 'ridiculous' which they have proved so satisfactorily, is really no indication of extensive reading, or of correct judgment. But I have observed, throughout the whole of this controversy, that when you speak with the utmost confidence, and accompany what you say with a sneer, you are sure to be wrong.

I have now, Sir, finished all that is necessary to be said on the subject of the controversy. Every thing material in your two volumes has been answered; and the APOSTOLIC INSTITUTION OF EPISCOPACY has been placed on such firm and solid grounds, as you will never be able to shake, were you to continue writing to the end of your days.

I am,

Rev. Sir,

Your obedient humble servant,

JOHN BOWDEN.

Columbia College, August 1, 1810.

---

try of the Scots—a sentiment which Bede delighted to repeat.' The reviewers further observe, that 'Chap. vi. contains a masterly abridgment of the Scoto-Irish history, from their first descent on the south-west coast of modern Scotland, to their final success in subduing the Pictish monarchy, under Kenneth, the son of Alpin. The account of this period cannot but be peculiarly interesting to every curious and intelligent Highlander. It is properly their national history. The clans, the language, the manners of that wild district are unquestionably Irish; and whoever amongst the most ancient and illustrious of those families dreams of a descent from the aborigines of Caledonia, while he finds in this chapter something to mortify his vanity, will meet with much more to enlighten his understanding." See the *Review*, p. 350, 352, 354.

Digitized by Google

AN ESSAY ON

THE

INVALIDITY OF PRESBYTERIAN ORDINATION.

BY JOHN ESTEN COOKE, M. D.

Second Edition.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

AN ESSAY &c.

When a man who has, for eighteen years of his life, taken an active part in the concerns of a religious society, and promoted its interest with all his power, leaves it and attaches himself to another, a decent respect for their opinion, as well as a proper regard for his own character for consistency and uprightness, renders it not improper that he should state the reasons which induced him to make the change. This I propose to do in the following pages.

Those who know me intimately, know that I have ever embraced the truth when convinced that I had discovered it, with little regard for the consequences that might follow. Having had the truths of the Christian religion impressed upon my mind by the unwearied care of a most affectionate mother, I occasionally had serious reflections on the subject, although in general by far too indifferent to it, until about nineteen years ago. In the summer of 1810, I met with a pamphlet called *The Star in the East*, by Dr. Buchanan, giving an account, among other things, of the discovery of a Christian Church in Hindostan, secluded from all the world, which derived its origin from the Apostles themselves. This narrative produced a very strong impression on my mind, and as I had been for some months more thoughtful than common on the subject of religion, I determined to investigate the evidence on which the doctrines of the Christian religion rest. Shortly after, a book-pedlar passed through the village, and I purchased a Bible with Canne's marginal references, and Bishop Porteus' *Evidences of the Christian Revelation.*

I had always been in the habit of requiring strong evidence upon every subject and never yielding assent to any thing, that was not supported by it. I sat down, therefore, to the reading of Porteus with the determination narrowly to examine and weigh every argument.

The result was a strong impression made on my mind by the first perusal, during which no quotations from the Scripture were examined, the interest excited by the force of the argument be-

Digitized by Google

ing too great to allow stopping to examine them. The book was read, however, very attentively a second time, with careful examination of the quotations of Scripture, and the result was a thorough conviction of the truth of the Christian Revelation; immediately on expressing which to myself, with an audible voice, I felt my mind drawn out in a feeling of gratitude and love to that SAVIOUR who had died that I might live—the first I had experienced, and not to be forgotten while life and recollection shall continue. The first reading of this book was in September or October, 1810. It had such an effect on my mind as to lead me to regular private devotion. The second reading was about Christmas.

Between the middle and end of January, I heard my friend Mr. Tidings, to whom I was then an entire stranger, preach for the first time, and again on the Sunday following, and was so much pleased, that on the Sunday week after, I became a member of the Methodist Society, which I then considered the purest Church as to doctrine. In that Society I have continued ever since, in general well satisfied; and among its members, but particularly the preachers of the Baltimore Annual Conference, I have many valued friends. These I would not offend, I would not appear to slight, for any thing less than conscience sake. That I have until within the last eight weeks taken an active part in promoting the welfare of the Society which I have left, is well known to some of them, and was not long ago evinced in the part I took in the establishment of a religious paper to be published by the Methodist Society.

Soon after that time, a volume of sermons by the Rev. Dr. Chapman, for which I had subscribed, was brought home, and for some days no attention was paid to it. At a leisure moment, curiosity led me to look into it, when I found the manner and style so striking, and the subject so new to me, that I determined to read the book. I had heard that the Church denied the validity of Presbyterian ordination; but had never thought it worth while to inquire into a claim at first sight apparently so extravagant. I was determined to see what could be said in support of such pretensions. I read carefully the first seven sermons, by which I was most forcibly struck. The language chaste—the style perspicuous—I was carried along without labour, and comprehended without the slightest effort. The manner of handling the subject was strikingly moderate, and as charitable as any man could reasonably desire. Supporting the doctrine of the invalidity of ordination by presbyters, and the validity of episcopal ordination alone, the author proceeds in maintaining the argument without uncharitable reflections; and when he condemns, does it in the mildest language, and often or always with expressions of good opinion of the motives of the opposite party. If there is any thing offensive to any one, in the book, it is a quotation—and quotations a man is bound to state as they are stated by the author from whom they are taken. To do

Digitized by Google

otherwise, to change language, to curtail, to omit material expressions, without informing the reader, is to act corruptly, and is so esteemed by all men of letters—and justly so.

The argument itself is exceedingly strong, and in the language of a gentleman of this place in conversation with me, it is the best array of the question, perhaps, any where to be found in the same compass.

The strength of the direct argument for the doctrine, and of that indirect one, growing out of the evil consequences of schism, or division from the Church, contained in some of the following sermons, is such, that I was compelled to say to myself—if these *facts* are so, this doctrine is the truth. Uneasiness now sprung up in my mind. The question arose, What if it be true? Can you leave your friends, your intimate associates in what has engaged so much of your attention, your efforts, your ardent desires for eighteen years, and go to a people who—prejudice whispered—are no people? The answer of conscience was, If it be the truth, embrace it, and leave the consequences to Him, who revealed his will to man for his guidance.

The question now was, Is this doctrine true? To determine this without delay, I sought information from ministers of the principal denominations involved in the doubt as to the validity of Presbyterian ordination, viz. the Presbyterians, the Methodists, and Baptists. With one consent they all referred me to MILLER's *Letters* on this subject. This book I immediately obtained. EMORY and BANGS were also mentioned, and were likewise obtained.

Meeting Dr. Chapman in the street, I inquired of him also what were the standard works on this controversy. He also mentioned MILLER—aud stated that BOWDEN had answered him. He also mentioned Lord KING (by whom Mr. Wesley was influenced,) and SLATER's *Original Draught* in answer to King, as well as POTTER *on Church Government* and HOOKER's work.

I immediately commenced reading Miller with great attention, read over and over the arguments respecting the order of the Church in the time of the Apostles, and for centuries afterwards, with his quotations from such of the fathers as could be procured conveniently—and with regard to those which I had not, I was enabled to form a very good idea from comparing him with Bowden. Thus, if he quoted a passage from an author which I had not the means of consulting, Bowden was examined to see what reply was made; if admitted by him, it could not be questioned; if not admitted, Miller's reply to Bowden's answer was examined; and if necessary, Bowden's rejoinder to Miller's reply. So that from the two works of each, it was not a difficult matter, with care, to make out what was agreed to by both these able disputants; and what was *asserted*, but, *when answered*, not *maintained* in the reply, and therefore given up: in short, it was not difficult to get at the truth.

Digitized by Google

The result of the whole investigation, after six weeks close inquiry, was a thorough conviction of the truth of the doctrine, that Presbyterian ordination is unauthorized by Scripture, and therefore entirely invalid.

In order that those of my friends and others into whose hands this pamphlet falls, without having it in their power to consult the books above mentioned, may be able to judge of the validity of the reasons on which rests the conclusion I have come to, I propose to make some remarks on the argument of Dr. Miller, the statements he has advanced, and the manner in which he has answered the arguments of the Episcopal writers—and close with a condensed statement of facts showing the invalidity of Presbyterian ordination.

The argument of Dr. Miller consists of the four following positions:

"That CHRIST gave but one commission for the office of the Gospel ministry, and that this office, of course, is one.

"That the words *Bishop*, and *Elder* or *Presbyter*, are uniformly used in the New Testament as convertible titles for the same office.

"That the same *character* and *powers* which are ascribed, in the sacred writings, to *Bishops*, are also ascribed to *Presbyters*; thus plainly establishing the identity of *order*, as well as of *name*." And finally,

"That the Christian Church was organized by the Apostles after the model of the *Jewish Synagogue*, which was unquestionably Presbyterian in its form."

"If these four positions (he says) can be established, there will remain no doubt on any candid mind, how the question in dispute ought to be decided." MILLER'S *Letters*, p. 28. [p. 15, 16, 2d *ed.*]

The *first* of these positions contains a proposition and an inference.

The truth of the proposition is granted. It is true that CHRIST gave but one commission for the office of the Gospel ministry: *but the inference is denied*; it is *not true* that the office of course is one. The inference is contrary to the plain facts of the New Testament. Without going further into the controversy, on this branch of it, than is necessary for the purpose of showing that there is *more than one office*, suffice it to say, that, besides the apostolic office, plain directions are given in the first Epistle to Timothy respecting the qualifications of Bishops, or Presbyters and Deacons; and the latter are mentioned in Scripture as ministering in the word and baptizing.

Thus when, in consequence of the great persecution of the Church at Jerusalem, the disciples were scattered abroad, *Philip* (the deacon) *went down to the city of Samaria, and preached* CHRIST *unto them.*[a] In the same chapter of the Acts it is stated,

[a] Acts viii. 5.

Digitized by Google

that Philip also preached JESUS to the Æthiopian, and baptized him.[b] The same Philip is in another place called *an evangelist*,[c] literally a *bearer of good news*, or *of the Gospel.*

It is evident, therefore, that there were, besides the apostolic, at least two other offices in the ministry, those of the Presbyters and the Deacons; and the matter of fact is opposed to the truth of the inference of Dr. Miller: and that inference being the point upon which his whole argument turns or rests, and being unfounded and contrary to plain facts, the argument built upon it falls to the ground.

The *second* and *third* positions, that the names, *Bishop* and *Elder* were names of the *same office*, no one disputes—it is not even the question in dispute—the question is, whether or not there was in the Church in those times an office *superior* to these Presbyters or Bishops, with power to appoint them, to receive and try charges against them, and to rebuke and reprove them publicly if they sinned.

If any one has any doubt on this subject, let him turn to the first epistle to Timothy and see what power he had over these Presbyters or Bishops.

Paul had been in Ephesus preaching and disputing daily for three years,[d] when he determined to go to Macedonia, Greece, Jerusalem, and Rome;[e] and besought Timothy, his constant companion for several years,[f] to *abide at Ephesus*;[g] and that *he might know how he ought to behave* or conduct himself in the Church, he wrote, he tells him,[h] this epistle. In it he gives him sundry directions as to doctrine, and as to his conduct towards all the members of the Church, male and female, old and young, rich and poor, in and out of office. He tells him what kind of men will suit for the office of Presbyter and what for that of Deacon,[i] and warns him to *lay hands suddenly on no man*;[k] if the elders rule well, they were to be honoured; if they were to be accused, he was not to receive the accusation without two or three witnesses, and if they sinned, he was to *rebuke them before all, that* OTHERS[l] *also may fear*; and Paul charges Timothy *before* GOD, and the LORD JESUS CHRIST, and *the elect Angels, to observe these things, without preferring one before another, doing nothing by partiality.*[m]

Here Paul manifestly shows that Timothy is to be the judge and punisher, if these Presbyters sin; but if Timothy act partially there is no redress, and the appeal of Paul is to GOD, there being no human authority over him: and seeing that his charge is so important, and that Timothy is but a young man, he *charges* him solemnly several times to do his duty, and uses these most emphatic words, *I give thee charge in the sight of*

b Acts viii. 35—38.
c Acts xxi. 8.
d See Acts xix.; particularly verses 8, 9, 10; xx. 31.
e Acts xix. 21.
f Acts xvi., &c.
g 1 Tim. i. 3.
h 1 Tim. iii. 14, 15.
i 1 Tim. iii.
k 1 Tim. v. 32.
l THE REST. See more of this hereafter.
m 1 Tim. v. 17—21.

Digitized by Google

GOD, *who quickeneth all things, and before* CHRIST JESUS, *who before Pontius Pilate witnessed a good confession, that thou keep this commandment without spot, unrebukeable,* UNTIL THE APPEARING OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST.[n]

It will subsequently appear that there is evidence in the Acts to show that Timothy continued in Ephesus in this charge, five years and a half at least: how much longer is uncertain.

The argument of Dr. Miller on the *fourth* position consists of an attempt to show the analogy between the Christian Church and the Jewish Synagogue with respect to name, mode of worship, titles of officers, their character, duties, and powers, and the mode of ordaining officers. On the other hand, the Episcopal writers contend that the analogy is stronger between the Christian Church and the *Temple* worship, its officers, &c.; and for this they bring the most express declaration of the Christian fathers. Thus Jerome, on whose evidence Dr. Miller rests with great confidence, asserting that it is decisive in his favour, on this point says, "We know that what *Aaron* and his sons *were*, that the Bishop and Presbyters *are*."[o]

It is, however, useless to enter upon an analogical argument; especially as it involves the necessity of discussing the main question in order to settle it, and the main question cannot be decided by the decision of such a subordinate one. If either party should feel pressed by it, they could not be satisfied to abide by a decision unless the main question were discussed.

It is proposed next to notice some statements which Dr. Miller seems to consider as enough to settle the question. He says, "The Scriptures also represent *Presbyters* as empowered to ordain and as actually exercising this power. Of this we can produce at least three instances of the most decisive kind.

"The first is recorded in *Acts* xiii., as follows: *Now there were in the Church that was at Antioch, certain prophets and teachers, as Barnabas and Simeon, that was called Niger, and Lucius of Cyrene, and Manaen, which had been brought up with Herod the Tetrarch, and Saul. As they ministered to the* LORD, *and fasted, the* HOLY GHOST *said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them. And when they had fasted and prayed, and laid hands on them, they sent them away.* This (he says) is the most ample account of an ordination to be found in Scripture; and it is an account which, were there no other, would be sufficient to decide the present controversy in our favour."

It is proper to remark here, that Dr. Miller does not make any attempt to show that the Scriptures *represent* Presbyters *as empowered to ordain, and as actually exercising the power.* He only brings forward certain cases which *he represents* as instances in which the power was actually exercised. Dr. Miller

n 1 Tim. vi. 13, 14.

o *Epist. ad Nepotian.*—See BOWDEN, Vol. I. p. 6. [p. 4, 2d *ed.*]

Digitized by Google

may have intended nothing more than this in the expressions above mentioned, but it is proper to make the remark, that stating the cases is all he has done.

With respect to the cases brought forward, it requires nothing more than a little attention to the history of Paul and Barnabas in the Acts of the Apostles, to discover that the ceremony related above was not *an ordination to the ministry.* Paul was converted at or near Damascus, and gives the following account of his conversion and call to the ministry, in his speech before King Agrippa. *Whereupon as I went to Damascus, with authority and commission from the chief priests, at midday, O King, I saw in the way a light from heaven, above the brightness of the sun, shining round about me, and them which journeyed with me. And when we were all fallen to the earth, I heard a voice speaking unto me, and saying in the Hebrew tongue, Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me? It is hard for thee to kick against the pricks. And I said, Who art thou,* LORD? *And he said, I am* JESUS *whom thou persecutest. But rise, and stand upon thy feet: for I have appeared unto thee for this purpose, to make thee* A MINISTER AND A WITNESS *both of these things which thou hast seen, and of those things in the which I will appear unto thee; delivering thee from the people, and from the Gentiles, unto whom now I send thee: to open their eyes and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto* GOD; *that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified, by faith that is in me. Whereupon, O King Agrippa, I was not disobedient to the heavenly vision: but showed first unto them at Damascus, and at Jerusalem, and throughout all the coasts of Judea, and then to the Gentiles, that they should repent and return to* GOD, *and do works meet for repentance.*[p]

Luke, speaking of Paul's conversion, uses language to the same amount with the latter part of this quotation. He says of Paul, *And straightway* (that is, immediately after his conversion) *he preached* CHRIST *in the Synagogues, that he is the* SON OF GOD."[q]

Paul, in his epistle to the Galatians, speaking of this same important transaction, says, when it pleased GOD *to reveal his Son in me, that I might* PREACH HIM AMONG THE HEATHEN; IMMEDIATELY *I conferred not with flesh and blood: neither went I up to Jerusalem to them* WHICH WERE APOSTLES BEFORE ME; *but I went into Arabia, and returned again unto Damascus. Then* AFTER THREE YEARS, *I went up to Jerusalem to see Peter, and abode with him fifteen days. But other of the Apostles saw I none, save James the* LORD'S *brother. Now, the things which I write unto you, behold, before* GOD, *I lie not. Afterwards I came into the regions of Syria and*

p Acts xxvi. 12—20. q Acts ix. 20.

Digitized by Google

Cilicia; and was unknown by face unto the Churches of Judea which were in CHRIST: *but they had heard only, that he which persecuted us in times past, now preacheth the faith which he once destroyed. And they glorified* GOD *in me. Then* FOURTEEN YEARS AFTER, *I went up* AGAIN *to Jerusalem with Barnabas, and took Titus with me also.*[r]

Here we find Paul, while journeying to Damascus to destroy the disciples, suddenly arrested, convinced of his error, converted to GOD—sent *immediately* to the Gentiles, to open their eyes and to turn them from the power of Satan to GOD—*straightway* preaching to them that CHRIST was the SON OF GOD, first in Damascus, and afterwards in Arabia and the regions of Syria and Cilicia—and finally going to Jerusalem, fourteen years after his first visit to that city to see Peter, and seventeen years after his conversion, in company with Barnabas.

Let us now see where he met with Barnabas, and what the employment of the latter had been.

Barnabas is first mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles in the following manner: *Neither was there any among them that lacked; for as many as were possessors of lands or houses sold them, and brought the prices of the things that were sold, and laid them down at the Apostles' feet: and distribution was made unto every man according as he had need. And Joses, who by the Apostles was surnamed Barnabas, (which is, being interpreted, The Son of Consolation,) a Levite, and of the country of Cyprus, having land, sold it, and brought the money, and laid it at the Apostles' feet.*[s] When, some years afterwards, Paul first went to Jerusalem after his conversion, *he assayed to join himself to the disciples: but they were all afraid of him, and believed not that he was a disciple. But* BARNABAS *took him, and brought him to the Apostles, and declared unto them how he had seen the* LORD: &c[t]. and they then received Paul. Some time after that, the Church at Jerusalem having heard that of the Gentiles at Antioch, *a great number believed and turned to the* LORD—*sent forth* BARNABAS *that he should go as far as Antioch. Who when he came, and had seen the grace of* GOD, *was glad, and exhorted them all that with purpose of heart they would cleave unto the* LORD. *For he was a good man, and full of the* HOLY GHOST *and of faith. And much people was added unto the* LORD. Barnabas, finding the prospects so favourable in Antioch, *went to Tarsus, to seek Saul: and when he had found him, he brought him unto Antioch. And it came to pass, that a whole year* THEY *assembled themselves with the Church, and* TAUGHT *much people. And the disciples were called Christians first in Antioch. And in those days came prophets from Jerusalem unto Antioch. And there stood up one of them named Agabus, and signified by the* SPIRIT, *that there should be great*

r Gal. i. 15—24. ii. 1. s Acts iv. 34—37. t Acts ix. 26, 27.

Digitized by Google

dearth throughout all the world: which came to pass in the days of Claudius Cæsar. Then the disciples, every man according to his ability, determined to send relief unto the brethren which dwelt in Judea: which also they did, and sent it to the elders by the hands of Barnabas and Saul.[u]

And *then* it was that Saul or Paul, as he states in his epistle to the Galatians, went *again* to Jerusalem *with Barnabas.*[v] While Paul and Barnabas were in Jerusalem, they had a conference with the Apostles James, Peter, and John—and Paul tells us in his epistle to the Galatians, that *When James, Cephas,* (or Peter) *and John, who seemed to be pillars, perceived the grace that was given unto me, they gave to me and* BARNABAS *the right hands of fellowship; that* WE *should go unto the heathen and they unto the circumcision.—And Barnabas and Saul returned from Jerusalem, when they had fulfilled their ministry, and took with them John, whose surname was Mark.*[w]

After their return to Antioch—it is not said how long—at least seventeen years after Paul had been preaching the gospel—occurred the transaction related in the beginning of the 13th chapter of the Acts, which Dr. Miller calls the *ordination* of Paul and Barnabas: —*Now there were in the Church that was at Antioch, certain prophets and teachers, as Barnabas, and Simeon that was called Niger, and Lucius of Cyrene, and Manaen, which had been brought up with Herod the Tetrarch, and Saul. As they ministered to the* LORD, *and fasted, the* HOLY GHOST *said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them. And when they had fasted and prayed, and laid their hands on them, they sent them away.*

The language of the HOLY SPIRIT here is, *Separate me Barnabas and Saul* FOR THE WORK WHEREUNTO I HAVE CALLED THEM. Certainly not for the work *of the ministry.* The LORD JESUS CHRIST had called Paul to *that work* at least seventeen years before, (*see* page 205; and Barnabas had been occupied in the same way for several years, the latter part of the time in connexion with Paul; and when they were in Jerusalem together, the Apostles James, Peter, and John, had agreed with Paul and Barnabas, that the former should go to the Jews, the latter to the Gentiles, (*see above.*) It is only necessary to read the 13th and 14th chapters of the Acts with attention, in order to ascertain what work it was they were then called to do. They immediately went on a tour through several countries of Asia and Islands of the Mediterranean sea, and after having traversed them, preaching the Gospel for a considerable time, they returned *to Antioch, from whence they had been recommended to the grace of* GOD *for the work* WHICH THEY FULFILLED.[x]

---

u Acts xi. 21—30. v Gal. ii. 1. w Gal ii. 9. Acts xii. 25.
x Acts xiv. 25.

Digitized by Google

There are two remarks to be made on this passage:

1. The ceremony performed at Antioch, before their departure, is here called *a recommendation to the grace of* GOD. Now, if this be an ordination, then was Paul again ordained some short time afterwards, on setting out on a similar tour through the country to visit the Churches:—*And Paul chose Silas, and departed, being* RECOMMENDED BY THE BRETHREN TO THE GRACE OF GOD. *And he went through Syria and Cilicia, confirming the Churches.*[y]

2. It is said in the passage above quoted, that *they had* FULFILLED *the work for which they had been recommended to the grace of* GOD. This work was, therefore, certainly not that of the ministry: *that* they had *not fulfilled:* they continued long afterwards in it, and Paul died a martyr to the cause.

Stress has likewise been laid on the *laying on of hands* on this occasion. That ceremony was performed on many other occasions besides ordination. Paul *laid his hands* on twelve disciples whom he found at Ephesus, immediately after baptizing them, and they received the HOLY GHOST.[z] Peter and John *laid their hands* on the new disciples in Samaria, and they received the HOLY GHOST; and some of these were women.[a] And long before this, Ananias, by the express command of GOD, *laid his hands* on Saul or Paul, while sitting blind in Damascus, and he received the HOLY GHOST.[b]

These several considerations render it manifest that this was *not an ordination.* But even if it could be shown to be so, it would remain to be proved that the *persons ordaining were presbyters*, before Dr. Miller could derive any benefit from the case. This cannot be done. There were five persons concerned, including Paul and Barnabas. They are called *prophets* and *teachers.* These words are not used in Scripture as names of office. They are so general in their nature as to embrace all the orders. Private Christians were sometimes thus employed.[c] Our SAVIOUR was *a prophet and teacher.*[d] Of the persons named in the transaction in question, one (Paul) was sent to the Gentiles, to *open their eyes* and *turn them from the power of Satan to* GOD, seventeen years before that time; another (Barnabas) had been for some time engaged with Paul in the same work: they had both, before that time, in a conference with the Apostles James, Peter, and John, at Jerusalem, agreed with them to divide, as it were, mankind among them; the Apostles James, Peter and John going to the Jews, and the Apostles Barnabas and Paul going to the Gentiles. Here then two of these five prophets and teachers, were *Apostles*—what the other three were we do not know: we do know however, that they were not superior to Paul and Barnabas.

Another consideration is, that the order of Apostles *must*

---

y Acts xv. 40, 41. z Acts xix. 6. a Acts viii. 12, and 14 to 17 compared.
b Acts ix. 17. c Acts xix. 6. xx. 9. d John iii. 2.

Digitized by Google

commence with laying on of hands by apostolic men. The first *must* derive their authority from GOD alone. Paul did so. He tells us expressly, that he WAS AN APOSTLE NOT OF MEN, NOR BY MAN, BUT BY JESUS CHRIST, AND GOD THE FATHER,[e]—and that the Apostles, while he was in Jerusalem IN CONFERENCE ADDED NOTHING TO HIM.[f]

"The second instance of an ordination performed by *Presbyters*, (says Dr. Miller,) is that of Timothy, which is spoken of by the Apostle Paul in the following terms: *Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery.*[g] All agree, (he says) that the Apostle is here speaking of Timothy's ordination; and this ordination is expressly said to have been performed *with the laying on of the hands of* THE PRESBYTERY—that is, of *the Eldership*, or a council of *Presbyters.*" MILLER'S *Letters*, p. 53. [p. 31, 2d *ed.*]

It is obvious indeed in the passage quoted, that the gift is said to have been given *by* prophecy and *with* the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery. By prophecy of whom? In the second epistle to Timothy (i. 6.) it is said that the gift was in Timothy by putting on of the hands *of Paul.* PAUL therefore BY prophecy and BY laying on his hands ordained Timothy, as he had before done in many instances,[h] in company with Barnabas, without mention of the laying on of the hands *of Presbyters.*

Of the reference to the precise meaning of the words *by* and *with*, in this case, in order to understand the passage, Dr. Miller speaks very contemptuously. But I know no other way of getting at the meaning, than by weighing well the signification of the words in which it is conveyed. It is to be observed that in the Greek, the word δια precedes *both* the words which signify *prophecy* and *hands*, and the word μετα precedes the word which signifies *presbytery.* What was this difference for, if it was not to express a difference? The word δια signifies *by;* the word μετα signifies *with*, or *together with.* There is no other signification given of μετα, in the folio Lexicon of Scapula, when it is used with the genitive case, as is done in the passage in question.

The plain meaning is therefore, that the gift was communicated by Paul, *by* prophecy and *by* laying on his hands, *together with* the laying on the hands of the presbytery; and this is the mode in which the ceremony of ordination of presbyters is performed in the Church at this day. The office is conferred by the Bishop *by* the laying on of his hands, the Presbyters laying on their hands *together with* his. It is therefore evidently absurd to insist upon this case as decisive of the question, as Dr. Miller has done; especially as the construction he puts upon it, compels him to translate different Greek words δια and μετα by the same English word *by;* when the use of the two different words in

e Gal. i. 1. f Gal. ii. 6. g 1. Tim. iv. 14. h Acts xiv. 23

Digitized by Google

the same sentence, shows that a difference was intended. If Paul had intended no difference, he would have said, *Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy and the laying on of the hands of the presbytery.*

The last instance mentioned by Dr. Miller, as a presbyterian ordination of the most decisive kind, "is that of *Paul* and *Barnabas*, who, after having been regularly set apart to the work of the ministry themselves, proceeded *through the cities of Lystra, Iconium*, &c. *And when they had ordained them Elders in every Church, and had prayed with fasting, they commended them to the* LORD, *on whom they had believed.* Our adversaries (says Dr. Miller) will perhaps say, that *Paul* alone performed these ordinations, in his apostolic or episcopal character; and that *Barnabas* only laid on hands to express his approbation of what *Paul* did." MILLER'S *Letters*, p. 59, [p. 35, 2d *ed.*]

Dr. Miller here insinuates that the Episcopalians must admit that Barnabas was nothing more than a Presbyter, and therefore they will perhaps say that Paul alone performed these ordinations; and that Barnabas only laid on his hands to express his approbation, as a Presbyter, of what Paul did. Truth will not, however, allow them to admit this of Barnabas: they certainly will not call him any thing less than an Apostle, when he is in the Acts called *an Apostle*, and together with Paul exercised, as fully as he did, the apostolic office. This cannot be reasonably questioned after reading the history of Barnabas; his constant connexion and fellowship with Paul; his receiving with Paul the right hand of *fellowship* from the Apostles James, Peter, and John, in Jerusalem; and the agreement that James, Peter, and John should go to the Jews, and Barnabas and Paul to the Gentiles; the extensive travels of Barnabas and Paul through Asia preaching to the Gentiles, related in the 11th to the 15th chapters of the Acts—in the 14th and 15th verses of the 14th chapter of which, we read as follows: *Which when* THE APOSTLES BARNABAS *and* PAUL, *heard of, they rent their clothes, and ran in among the people, crying out, and saying, Sirs, why do ye these things?*[i] Here Barnabas is called *an Apostle* by Luke, the writer of the Acts. Dr. Miller, indeed, makes an attempt to shew that Barnabas was only *a messenger*, and that he is called *Apostle* in a vague sense. No more need be said of this attempt —desperate it surely may be called—than this, that whatever Paul was, Barnabas must have been; the words of Scripture are, THE APOSTLES PAUL AND BARNABAS. So much for these three cases, represented by Dr. Miller as instances of *ordination by presbyters* 'of the most decisive kind.'

It is proposed next to show in what manner Dr. Miller has answered some arguments of the Episcopalian writers. It is not my purpose to go through these arguments one by one. That would occupy more space and time than I have to devote jus-

i Acts xiv. 14, 15.

Digitized by Google

now to this subject. It is only intended to give the reader a specimen of the manner in which Dr. Miller is compelled to proceed in order to sustain the cause he is contending for.

One of the arguments of the Episcopalian writers is, Dr. Miller states, "That *the Apostles*, while they lived, held a station in the Church superior to all other ministers; that *Bishops* are the proper successors of the *Apostles*; and that they hold a corresponding superiority of character and office." Of this he says, "If this argument be examined, it will be found to have no other force than that which consists in a mere gratuitous assertion of the point to be proved." MILLER'S *Letters*, p. 88, [p. 56, 2d *ed.*]

"Accordingly (he says) when we ask those who adduce this argument, whence they derive the idea that diocesan Bishops peculiarly succeed the Apostles in their Apostolic character, (for this supposition alone is to their purpose,) they refer us to no passages of Scripture asserting or even hinting it; but to some vague suggestions and allusions of a few of the early fathers." MILLER'S *Letters*, p. 90, [p. 58, 2d *ed.*]

1. Dr. Miller says 'they refer us to no passages of Scripture asserting or even hinting *that diocesan Bishops peculiarly succeed the Apostles in their apostolical character.*'

How can the Scripture assert before-hand that a thing *is done?* (that *they succeed*, in the present tense.) What Episcopalians therefore would be simple enough to expect to find a passage in Scripture, asserting that the *Bishops do succeed* the Apostles in their apostolic office? In the nature of things they can only show that the Scriptures ascribe certain powers to the heads of the Churches. We must look to the subsequent records of the Church for knowledge of what followed the time of the Apostles; and in them we find that these powers have been exercised by the Bishops throughout the world ever since—and that there is no departure from this, in any quarter of the world, except among the followers of a few who broke off from the Church, and not having that episcopal ordination which to this period was universal in the Church—which they had themselves always revered—which had given them all the authority they possessed, made up their mind to do without it, and perpetuate their party by ordaining others; alleging, in justification of themselves for this known and acknowledged departure from the practice of the Church, *the necessity of the case.*

2. Dr. Miller further says, they refer us '*to some vague suggestions and allusions of a few of the early fathers.*' MILLER'S *Letters*, p. 90, [p. 58, 2d *ed.*]

As a specimen of what Dr. Miller calls *vague suggestions and allusions*, let the reader turn to the appendix to these pages, and take a look at the epistles of Ignatius, one of the disciples of John, who was thrown into the amphitheatre at Rome by the order of the emperor Trajan, and devoured by lions, after forty years of service in the Church, because he would not deny the SAVIOUR. Being acquainted personally with some of the Apos-

Digitized by Google

tles, and the disciple of one of them, he certainly knew the order of the Church. He writes in very intelligible terms, and does not make 'a few vague suggestions and allusions.' Nothing can be more clear and distinct than his language. He mentions, in the course of his epistles to the Christians of Ephesus, Magnesia, Tralles, Philadelphia, and Smyrna, and to Polycarp, the different orders of ministers in the Church above *thirty* times; of which *twenty-nine* passages are contained in the epistles in the appendix, printed in italic letters.

In every instance the Bishop is mentioned in such terms as show that he was *the only one* in the Church addressed; and some of the cities in which these Churches were, were very populous, with great numbers of Christians. Thus the Church at Ephesus was very large, more than fifty years before this epistle was written.

In twelve of these passages, the Bishop is mentioned alone, viz. in the 1st, 2d, 5th and 6th sections of the Epistle to the Ephesians; in the 4th of that to the Magnesians; in the 2d and 7th of that to the Trallians; in the 1st, 3d, 7th and 8th of that to the Philadelphians; and in the 9th of that to the Smyrneans.

In these passages the Bishop is represented as chief or principal in the Church, over all, without whose consent nothing is to be done; particularly in the first italic lines in the 2d and 7th sections of the epistle to the Trallians; in the first italic lines of the 3d section, and the last of the 7th section of the epistle to the Philadelphians; and in the italic lines in the 9th section of the epistle to the Smyrneans. There is, however, very little choice, if we except the 1st and 2d sections to the Ephesians, and the 1st and 3d to the Philadelphians.

The Presbyters are not mentioned at all except in connexion with the Bishop.

They are mentioned *together* seventeen times in the epistles in the appendix. In *eight* passages the language shows, in the clearest manner, the inferiority and subordination of the Presbyters; *viz.* in the italic lines of the 4th section of the Epistle to the Ephesians; of the 3d and 6th to the Magnesians; of the 2d, 3d and 12th to the Trallians; of the 4th to the Philadelphians; and of the 8th to the Smyrneans: and in the other seven instances the Presbyters are invariably mentioned second to the Bishop, and the Deacons, when they are mentioned with the rest, third in order (in every instance except one) which happens seven times in the epistles in the appendix.[k]

Language cannot easily be devised to express more strongly than these passages in italics, that the Bishop is chief in the Church, the source of all authority, without whose consent nothing is to be done; that the Presbyters are subordinate to him, derive their authority from him, are bound to reverence him, and under a special obligation, more than others, to refresh him or

k See the Appendix for these statements.

Digitized by Google

support him; that the Deacons are third in office, and are ministers of the word of GOD, ambassadors of GOD, &c.;[l] and, lastly, THAT WITHOUT THESE THREE ORDERS THERE IS NO CHURCH.[m]

Dr. Miller goes on to observe, after speaking of the vague suggestions and allusions of a few early fathers, "Several of them expressly represent *Presbyters* as the successors of the Apostles. Among others, *Ignatius*, than whom no father is more highly esteemed, or more frequently quoted as an authority by Episcopalians, generally represents *Presbyters* as standing in the place of the Apostles."[n] The reader may easily determine how far this assertion is correct by turning to the passages *in italic letters* in the appendix to these pages.

Dr. Miller goes on to support this assertion respecting Ignatius's sentiments, by some quotations from his Epistles. He says, "The following quotations are from his far-famed Epistles. 'The Presbyters succeed in the place of the bench of the Apostles.'"

These words are taken from the 6th section of the Epistle to the Magnesians, and are detached from their connexion with what precedes and follows them. Take the whole together, and the meaning is precisely the reverse of that which Dr. Miller represents it to be. The whole passage runs thus, the words *in italics* and enclosed in a parenthesis, being those only which Dr. Miller quotes: "Forasmuch, therefore, as I have in the persons before mentioned, seen all of you in faith and charity; I exhort you that ye study to do all things in a divine concord: YOUR BISHOP PRESIDING IN THE PLACE OF GOD, (*your Presbyters in the place of the council of the Apostles;*) AND YOUR DEACONS MOST DEAR TO ME, BEING ENTRUSTED WITH THE MINISTRY OF JESUS CHRIST; who was with the Father before all ages, and appeared in the end to us."[o]

Dr. Miller's next quotation is in the following words: "In like manner let all reverence the Deacons as JESUS CHRIST, and the Bishop as the FATHER, and the Presbyters as the sanhedrim of GOD, and college of the Apostles."

This passage is found in the third section of the Epistle to the Trallians.

If these passages represent the Presbyters as standing in the place of the Apostles, they place the Bishop as far above them as he could by any language be represented to be.

Dr. Miller has not quoted a few words which, in the passage quoted last, immediately follow the word *Apostles*: viz. "WITHOUT THESE THERE IS NO CHURCH." These words throw a blaze of light on the subject. It must be remembered, that Dr. Miller is contending for the Presbyterian doctrine, that there is

l See Appendix; Epistle to the Magnesians, Sect. 6; to the Trallians, Sect. 2; to the Philadelphians, Sect. 4, 10, 11; to the Smyrneans, Sect. 12.

m Appendix, Epistle to the Trallians, Sect. 3.

n MILLER'S *Letters*, p. 90. [p. 58, 2d *ed.*]

o See Appendix; Epistle to the Magnesians, Sect. 6.

Digitized by Google

but one order of ministers, and that this order, viz. the Presbyters, are the successors of the Apostles, authorized by the same commission, and standing on a footing of official equality with those to whom it was originally delivered, so far as their office was ordinary and perpetual: on the contrary, that the Episcopalian doctrine is, that there are three orders of ministers, of which the Presbyter is the second, the Bishop being his superior. The words omitted, viz. *without these there is no Church*, show that there were three orders. *These* what? These *three orders* just named in the fore part of the quotation, viz. *the Bishop, the Presbyters, and the Deacons.* 'Without *these* there is no Church;' and of these the Bishop is the chief, not the Presbyters: for if the words be considered as 'representing the Presbyters as standing in the place of the Apostles,' they represent the Bishop as standing in the place of God. It is evident that Dr. Miller represents Ignatius as meaning what he never intended to say—what he has not said—and the very opposite of what he obviously has repeatedly said.

Dr. Miller's next quotation is in these words: "Be subject to your Presbyters as to the Apostles of Jesus Christ our hope."

This passage is found in the second section of Ignatius's Epistle to the Trallians; and is detached from its connexion with the words which precede and follow it. Take the whole passage, and the meaning is as different as it well can be. The whole passage runs thus, the words *in italics*, enclosed as before, being those which Dr. Miller quotes: "It is, therefore, necessary, THAT AS YE DO, SO WITHOUT YOUR BISHOP YOU SHOULD DO NOTHING: ALSO [*be ye subject to your Presbyters as to the Apostles of* JESUS CHRIST *our hope;*] in whom if we walk, we shall be found in him. The Deacons, also, as being the ministers of the mysteries of JESUS CHRIST, must by all means please all. For they are not the ministers of meat and drink, but of the Church of GOD."[p]

It is evident that here, also, Ignatius is represented as saying what he does not say, and as meaning what he never intended.

Dr. Miller's next quotation is as follows: "Follow the Presbytery as the Apostles."

This passage is taken from the 8th section of Ignatius's Epistle to the Smyrneans, and does not stand there in the order the words are quoted. The passage runs thus: *viz.* "SEE THAT YE ALL [*follow*] YOUR BISHOP, AS JESUS CHRIST, THE FATHER: AND [*the Presbytery, as the Apostles.*"] The words in small capitals are omitted, those only *in italics*, and enclosed as before, are quoted by Dr. Miller. Read the words in italics without those in small capitals, and the passage runs precisely as Dr. Miller has quoted it; and it has, to the ear, the appearance of supporting his doctrine. Read the whole as Ignatius wrote it, and the conviction is irresistible that his meaning was not what Dr. Miller represents it to be.

p See Appendix; Epistle to the Trallians, Sect. 2.

Digitized by Google

Dr. Miller proceeds in his fourth letter, to make some extracts from Ignatius, which he prefaces with the following observations: "I will venture to affirm, that instead of yielding to the cause of *diocesan episcopacy*, that efficient support which is imagined, they do not contain a *single sentence* which can be construed in its favour; but on the contrary, much which can only be reconciled with the primitive, *parochial episcopacy*, or presbyterian government, so evidently portrayed in Scripture, and so particularly defined in my first Letter." [The words *in italics* are thus printed in Miller's Letters.]

"The following extracts from these *epistles*, are among the strongest quoted by Episcopal writers in support of their cause."* (MILLER'S *Letters*, p. 140. [p. 92, 2d *ed.*) At the close of these extracts, he makes some observations which end with the following words: "I have been thus particular in attending to the testimony of Ignatius, because the advocates of prelacy have always considered him as more decidedly in their favour than any other father, and have contended for the genuineness of his writings with as much zeal as if the cause of episcopacy were involved in their fate. But you will perceive that these writings, when impartially examined, instead of affording aid to that cause, furnish decisive testimony against it."[q] Here follow the extracts.

"*Epistle to the Church of Ephesus, Sect.* v. "Let no man deceive himself; if a man be not within the altar he is deprived of the bread of GOD. For if the prayer of one or two be of such force, as we are told; how much more powerful shall that of the Bishop and the whole Church be? He, therefore, that does not come together into the same place with it, is proud, and has already condemned himself."

"*Epistle to the Church of Magnesia, Sect.* 2. "Seeing then I have been judged worthy to see you, by *Damas*, your most excellent Bishop, and by your very worthy Presbyters, *Bassus* and *Appollonius*, and by my fellow servant, *Sotio*, the Deacon —I determined to write unto you." *Sect.* 6. "I exhort you that ye study to do all things in a divine concord; your Bishop presiding in the place of GOD; your Presbyters in the place of the council of the Apostles; and your Deacons most dear to me, being intrusted with the ministry of JESUS CHRIST, who was with the Father before all ages, and appeared in the end to us. Let there be nothing that may be able to make a division among you; but be ye united to your Bishop, and those who preside over you, to be your pattern and direction in the way to immortality." *Sect.* 7. "As, therefore, the LORD did nothing without the FATHER, being united to him; neither by himself, nor yet by his Apostles; so neither do ye any thing without your Bishop

* "To cut off all occasion of doubt, as to the fairness used in translating these extracts, I think proper to state, that I adopt the translation of Archbishop Wake." [Dr. Miller's own note.]

q MILLER'S *Letters*, p. 148. [p. 97, 2d *ed.*]]

Digitized by Google

and Presbyters: Neither endeavour to let any thing appear rational to yourselves apart; but being come together into the same place, have one common prayer, one supplication, one mind; one hope, in charity, and in joy undefiled. There is one LORD JESUS CHRIST, than whom nothing is better. Wherefore come ye all together as unto one temple of GOD; as to one altar; as to one JESUS CHRIST; who proceeded from one FATHER, and exists in one, and is returned to one."

"*Epistle to the Trallians*, *Sect.* 2. "Whereas ye are subject to your Bishop as to JESUS CHRIST, ye appear to me to live not after the manner of men, but according to JESUS CHRIST; who died for us, that so believing in his death, ye might escape death. It is therefore necessary, that, as ye do, so without your Bishop, you should do nothing. Also be ye subject to your Presbyters, as to the Apostles of JESUS CHRIST our hope, in whom if we walk, we shall be found in him. The Deacons, also, as being the ministers of the mysteries of JESUS CHRIST, must by all means please all." *Sect.* 7. "Wherefore guard yourselves against such persons. And that you will do, if you are not puffed up; but continue inseparable from JESUS CHRIST our GOD, and from your Bishop, and from the command of the Apostles. He that is within the altar is pure; but he that is without, that is, that does any thing without the Bishop, and Presbyters, and Deacons, is not pure in his conscience."

"*The Epistle to the Church at Smyrna*, *Sect.* 8. "See that ye all follow your Bishop, as JESUS CHRIST, THE FATHER; and the Presbytery as the Apostles: and reverence the Deacons as the command of GOD. Let no man do any thing of what belongs to the Church separately from the Bishop. Let that Eucharist be looked upon as well established, which is either offered by the Bishop, or by him to whom the Bishop has given his consent. Wheresoever the Bishop shall appear, there let the people also be: as where JESUS CHRIST is, there is the Catholic Church. It is not lawful, without the Bishop, either to baptize, or to celebrate the holy communion. But whatsoever he shall approve of, that is also pleasing to GOD; that so whatever is done, may be sure and well done." *Sect.* 12. "I salute your very worthy Bishop, and your venerable Presbytery, and your Deacons, my fellow servants; and all of you in general, and every one in particular, in the name of JESUS CHRIST."

"*Epistle to Polycarp.* "*Ignatius* who is also called *Theophorus*, to *Polycarp*, Bishop of the Church which is at *Smyrna*; their overseer, but rather himself overlooked by GOD the Father, and the LORD JESUS CHRIST: all happiness!" *Sect.* 1. "Maintain thy place with all care, both of flesh and spirit: Make it thy endeavour to preserve unity, than which nothing is better. Speak to every one as GOD shall enable thee." *Sect.* 4. "Let not the widows be neglected: be thou after GOD, their guardian. Let nothing be done without thy knowledge and consent: neither do thou any thing but according to the will of GOD; as also

Digitized by Google

thou dost with all constancy. Let your assemblies be more full: inquire into all by name: overlook not the men nor maid servants; neither let them be puffed up, but rather let them be more subject to the glory of God, that they may obtain from him a better liberty." *Sect.* 5. "It becomes all such as are *married*, whether men or women, to come together with the consent of the Bishop; that so their marriage may be according to godliness, and not in lust."

"These are the passages in the Epistles of *Ignatius*, which Episcopal writers have triumphantly quoted, as beyond all doubt establishing their claims. Nothing stronger or more decisive is pretended to be found in these far famed relics of antiquity. Now I ask you, my brethren, whether there is in these extracts, a sentence that can serve their purpose?"[r]

But before the reader allows himself to answer the question with which this quotation from Dr. Miller closes, let him compare these extracts of his, with the Epistles themselves in the Appendix; and he will find that the Doctor has not by any means brought forward the strongest passages.

Dr. Miller has not quoted Section 4 of the Epistle to the Ephesians, which contains a very strong passage *in italics*. See the Appendix.

In quoting Section 5, he has omitted the words printed *in italics*, another strong passage. See the Appendix.

He has not quoted Section 6, containing a strong passage *in italics*. See Appendix.

In quoting Section 2 of the Epistle to the Magnesians, he has omitted the passage *in italics*, a strong one. See Appendix.

He has not quoted Section 3, containing a passage decisively showing the inferiority of Presbyters to the Bishop, and that they are bound to yield all reverence to him according to the power of God the Father. See Appendix.

In quoting Section 2 of the Epistle to the Trallians, he has omitted the following short sentence immediately succeeding that which he quotes; viz. "For they (that is the Deacons) are not the ministers of meat and drink, but of the Church of God." This passage bears directly and decisively on the controversy between the Episcopalians and the Presbyterians; the latter insisting that there is but one order of ministers in the Church, viz. the Presbyters, and that *Deacons are not ministers of the word.*

Dr. Miller has not quoted the 3d Section of the Epistle to the Trallians, containing a most decisive passage *in italics*. See the Appendix.

He has not quoted Section 12 of the same Epistle, also containing a decisive passage *in italics*.

He has not quoted Section 13 of the same, containing a strong passage *in italics*.

---

r Dr. Miller's *Letters*, p. 140—144, [p. 92—94, 2d *ed.*]

Digitized by Google

He has not quoted Section 4 of the Epistle to the Philadelphians, containing a strong passage: and,

He has not quoted Section 9 of the Epistle to the Smyrneans, containing a very strong passage.

All this may be seen by turning to the Appendix, and comparing it with Dr. Miller's quotations, pages 216 and 217 of this essay.

It may be added that Dr. Miller has quoted among those passages which, he states, are triumphantly quoted by Episcopalians, four from Ignatius's Epistle to Polycarp; viz. two sentences out of Section 1, most of the 4th, and part of the 5th Section. These extracts certainly are not among the strongest passages on the point in dispute; and as Dr. Miller is professing to give the strongest passages that have been advanced by Episcopalians, he has not done what he professed to do. One of these passages from Ignatius's Epistle to Polycarp, is so far from being among the strongest quoted by Episcopalians, that it is made use of by Dr. Miller himself as an argument in his own favour. And now that it is mentioned, it is not amiss to say *it* likewise is represented to signify what it does not.[a]

Dr. Miller represents Ignatius as telling Polycarp it was his duty "to be *personally acquainted* with all his flock; to take notice, *with his own eye*, of those who were *absent* from public worship; to attend to the *widows* and the *poor* of his congregation; to seek out all *by name*, and not to overlook even the *men* and *maid-servants* living in his parish." But the language of Ignatius is, "Let not the widows be neglected: be thou, after God, their guardian: let your assemblies be more full: inquire into all by name: overlook not the men and maid-servants;" &c.

The words in *italics* in this quotation from Dr. Miller are so marked by him: he therefore specially directs the attention of the reader to those words—and yet there is scarce one of them but what conveys a different idea from what the words of Ignatius do. Thus,

Ignatius says, "Let your assemblies be more full."

Miller *represents him as saying*; 'Take notice *with your own eye* of those who are absent from public worship.'

Ignatius; "Inquire into all by name: overlook not the men and maid-servants."

Miller; '*Seek out all by name* and do not overlook even the *men and maid-servants* living in the parish. *Be personally acquainted* with all the flock.'

Ignatius does not say any thing which implies the necessity of '*personal acquaintance*' with all, nor the necessity of noticing with '*his own eyes*' those who absent themselves from public worship, nor that of '*seeking out*' all by name. He urges no duties which a man may not perform in a large diocese.

Ignatius says, "Let not the widows be neglected." This he

---

[a] Compare pages 144, [94. 2d *ed.*] and 146, [95, 2d *ed.*] of Miller's *Letters*.

Digitized by Google

could do by causing the Presbyters and Deacons to do their duty, without seeing one of them.

Ignatius says, "Let your assemblies be more full." He could attend to this over a considerable extent of country, as the Presiding Elders of the Methodist Society do. They attend to this throughout their charge, and their districts are sometimes 300 miles long; urging the people and the preachers, as they pass and repass, and inquiring continually how far it is attended to.

Ignatius says, "Inquire into all by name; overlook not the men and maid-servants." This can be done without personal acquaintance. The preachers of the Methodist travelling connexion, on many circuits, have above a thousand, and on some twelve or fourteen hundred persons under their care,[t] sometimes spread over circuits of fifty or sixty miles in extent, and they inquire *into all by name*, not overlooking the men and maid-servants, *every four weeks*, and many of these they do not recognize if they meet them in the road. Mr. Wesley in his *Journal*, (the passage I cannot refer to at this moment, not having the book,) speaks of going into a town where there were many hundred persons in the Methodist Society, and, taking the lists into his hands, inquiring into the state of all by name: and this kind of superintendance Mr. Wesley exercised over all England. It is most obvious, therefore, that the injunction of Ignatius may without much difficulty be attended to, even when great numbers are spread over a large space.

It surely cannot be deemed uncharitable to call this a forced and strained paraphrase of Ignatius's advice to Polycarp; and this, connected with Dr. Miller's *expressions*, "to attend to the widows and the *poor of the congregation*," and "not to overlook the men and maid-servants *living in the parish*," is evidently intended to induce the reader to believe, contrary to the whole tenor of the Epistles of Ignatius, who wrote this to Polycarp, that the attention of the latter was confined to a *single* congregation or parish in Smyrna.

It cannot be doubted that these omitted sections, sentences, and parts of sentences, have a most material bearing on the question. The passages selected by Dr. Miller are so worded, or are so altered, that a person previously persuaded of the Presbyterian doctrine, that there is but one order of ministers, (and these called Bishops in the *Confession of Faith*,) having under them Elders or Presbyters, and Deacons, may find nothing in them inconsistent with his views. But the omitted passages show beyond all question, that these inferior orders are ministers of the word. The Deacons, the lowest order, are called *ambassadors of* God,[u] are said to be *entrusted with the ministry of* Jesus Christ,[v] to be *ministers of the mysteries of* Jesus

t See their Printed *Minutes*.

u See Appendix; Epist. to Philadelphians, Sect. 10, 11.

v Appendix; Epistle to the Magnesians, Sect. 6.

Digitized by Google

CHRIST; and *not the ministers of meat and drink, but of the Church of* GOD:[w] and why should it be doubted that Deacons are ministers, when we know from Scripture, that when the disciples were driven out of Jerusalem, *the Deacon* Philip went down to Samaria, and preached the gospel and baptized the converts there, and in other places.[x]

It is further to be observed, that in that part of his volume in which he makes these extracts, Dr. Miller is compelled by the positive assertion of the superiority of the Bishop, to contend that he (the Bishop) is a parochial or Presbyterian Bishop, with his Elders or Presbyters under him. He says, "But is there a single hint in these extracts which looks as if the Bishops mentioned in them were of a distinct and superior order?"[y] After answering his own question in the negative, he asks, of the Presbyters, "But what kind of officers were these Presbyters? The friends of prelacy, without hesitation, answer they were the inferior clergy, who ministered to the several congregations belonging to each of the dioceses mentioned in these Epistles; an order of clergy subject to the Bishop, empowered to preach, baptize, and administer the LORD'S Supper; but having no power to ordain or confirm. But all this is said without the smallest evidence."[z] "The whole strain of these epistles, then, may be considered as descriptive of presbyterian government. They exhibit a number of particular churches, each furnished with a *Bishop* or *Pastor*, and also with *Elders* and *Deacons*."[a] And yet these very Elders or Presbyters, *here* represented as nothing more than the elders in a Presbyterian Church, subordinate to the pastor, are *in another part of the volume* represented as standing in the place of the Apostles; and the very same passages are quoted to prove both. This will appear at once on comparing Dr. Miller's quotations from the Epistles of Ignatius, p. 91 [58] of his Letters, (p. 213 &c. of this Essay,) with the extracts from the same stated in p. 141 [92] &c. of his Letters, (p. 215 &c. of this Essay.) This utter inconsistency—the necessity for taking different and opposite grounds in different parts of the argument in order to maintain this doctrine, shows that it has no strong ground to rest upon.

After proceeding with quotations from several other fathers, Dr. Miller observes, "I have now gone through the testimony of those fathers who lived and wrote within the first *two centuries* after CHRIST, the limits which I prescribed to myself at the beginning of this letter. And I can solemnly assure you, my brethren, that the foregoing extracts, besides what I have deemed favourable to our own cause, also contain, to the best of my knowledge and belief, *the strongest passages* that are to be found, within that period, in support of diocesan episcopacy. I

---

w Appendix; Epist. to Trallians, Sect. 2.
x Acts viii. 5, 12, 35—38, 40.
y MILLER'S *Letters*, p. 145, [p. 95, 2d *ed.*]
z *Ibid.* p. 146, [p. 96, 2d *ed.*]
a *Ibid.* p. 148, [p. 96, 2d *ed.*]

Digitized by Google

may confidently challenge the most zealous Episcopalian to produce, out of the writers of those times, a single sentence which speaks more *fully* or *decidedly* in favour of his system, than those which have been presented. If there be any such, I have not been so fortunate as to meet with them; nor have the ablest Episcopal writers with whom I have been conversant, appeared to know of their existence. You have before you, not merely a *specimen* of those quotations which they consider as most favourable to their cause, but in fact, *the great body* [b] of the strongest and best passages for their purpose, that they are able to produce.

"Let me, then, appeal to your candour, whether the assertions made at the beginning of this letter, are not fully supported.—Have you seen a single passage which proves that Christian *Bishops*, within the first two centuries, were, in fact, an order of clergy distinct from those *Presbyters* who were authorized to preach and administer sacraments, and superior to them?"

How far Dr. Miller is authorized to use this strong language, the reader may judge from the comparison he has already made of his quotations from Ignatius's Epistles, with those epistles themselves. It may be observed that the words in *italics*, in the quotation above, are so marked in Miller's Letters.

Moreover, the reply to the question with which this quotation concludes, viz. "*Have you seen* A SINGLE PASSAGE *which proves that Christian Bishops, within the first two centuries, were, in fact, an order of clergy distinct from those Presbyters who were authorized to preach and administer sacraments and superior to them?*"—the reply, I say, to this question the reader is requested to make for himself, after reading the passages *in italics*, in Ignatius's Epistles in the Appendix to this Essay, with the word *Presbyter* substituted for the word *Bishop* in every case. This substitution is perfectly proper, if *Bishop* and *Presbyter* are names of *the same officer* in the Church, *with the same character and powers*, as Dr. Miller contends.[c]

If this substitution be made in the 4th section of the Epistle to the Ephesians, it will run thus: "Wherefore it will become you to run together according to the will of your *Presbyter*, as also ye do. For your famous presbytery, (or *Council* of *Presbyters*) worthy of GOD, is fitted as exactly to the *Presbyter* as the strings are to the harp."

The same substitution being made, of *Presbyter* for *Bishop*, the 3rd section of the Epistle to the Magnesians will run thus; "Wherefore it will become you also not to use your *Presbyter* too familiarly upon the account of his youth; but to yield all reverence to him according to the power of GOD the Father; as also I perceive that your holy *Presbyters* do," &c.

---

b [These words "the great body," and *these* ONLY, are omitted in Dr. Miller's new edition of his *Letters*, published since the appearance of this Essay.]

c *Letters*, p. 6, [p. 5. 2d *ed.*]

Digitized by Google

In the same way we shall have in Section 7 of the same Epistle, "so neither do ye do any thing without your *Presbyter* and *Presbyters*."

In Section 12 of the Epistle to the Trallians, we shall have, "For it becomes every one of you, especially *the Presbyters*, to refresh *the Presbyter*," &c.—and so of other passages *in italics* in the Appendix.

In making these quotations I have had in view nothing but the maintenance of the truth. It has been done with a feeling of regret: but "let the truth prevail" ought to be the sentiment of every man; let parties fall before it, *till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the* SON OF GOD, *unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of* CHRIST: *that we henceforth be no more children tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men.*"

It is proposed lastly to show from a statement of facts drawn from Scripture, that the apostolic Church was episcopal; and, from the testimony of those who succeeded the Apostles in the charge of the Church, that it continued to be so after the times of the Apostles.

WHEN important concerns are the subject of controversy, it is of great moment to ascertain the points on which the parties agree, and those which are in dispute. The parties to the controversy now under consideration, agree in some capital particulars. Dr. Miller gives the following striking and correct view of the subject.

"Religion is the common business of all men. Its duties cannot be performed by delegation. Every man is required to examine, to believe, and to obey the Gospel for himself, and for himself to receive the promised reward. We may commit other concerns to the wisdom and fidelity of our fellow-men: but the care of his own soul belongs to each individual; and if he neglect it, no solicitude, no exertions on the part of others, can possibly avail him.

"But although religion be a concern which equally belongs to every man, yet it has pleased the all-wise Head of the Church to appoint an order of men more particularly to *minister in holy things*." "If all the interests of the Church are precious in the view of every enlightened Christian, it is evident that the *mode of its organization*, cannot be a trivial concern." "Christians, in all ages, are bound to make the apostolic order of the Church, with respect to the ministry, as well as other points, the model, as far as possible, of all their ecclesiastical arrangements."[d]

These important points agreed upon, the question to be decided

d MILLER'S *Letters*, p. 3, 6, 8, [p. 1, 3, 4. 2d *ed.*]

Digitized by Google

is, WHAT WAS THE ORDER OF THE CHURCH ESTABLISHED BY THE APOSTLES?

2.[e] The conversion of Paul, and his call to the ministry, are decidedly the most remarkable on record. The LORD JESUS CHRIST called to him at mid-day, when overwhelmed with the brightness of His presence and fallen to the earth, and said, *I am* JESUS *whom thou persecutest. But rise, and stand upon thy feet: for I have appeared unto thee for this purpose, to make thee a minister and a witness, both of these things which thou hast seen, and of those things in the which I will appear unto thee; delivering thee from the people and from the Gentiles, unto whom* NOW *I send thee,* TO OPEN THEIR EYES, AND TO TURN THEM FROM DARKNESS TO LIGHT, AND FROM THE POWER OF SATAN UNTO GOD; *that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith that is in me.*[f]

3. Paul, without delay, commenced the work thus committed to his hands; and devoted himself with such boldness, ardour, and perseverance in the cause as has never been surpassed, perhaps never equalled. He planted Churches in various places, particularly in Asia, spending several years in building up the Church in one city and then passing to another, leaving the work in the hands of chosen men on whom he could rely. To these Churches and to these men he wrote various epistles, consisting chiefly of directions for the conduct of those to whom they were addressed; and, consequently, those to the persons to whom he had given the charge of Churches, contain full directions for their conduct in every particular *as to the order of the Church*, and it is from these full directions that we are to learn the apostolical order of the Church, in order to ascertain whether any particular ecclesiastical arrangements agree with that order.

4. One of the Churches established and built up by the labour, care, and perseverance of Paul, was that of Ephesus. On his first visit to that city, *he entered the synagogue and reasoned with the Jews. When they desired him to tarry longer time with them, he consented not: but bade them farewell, saying, I must by all means keep this feast that cometh, in Jerusalem: but I will return again unto you, if* GOD *will.*[g]

5. Some time afterwards, Paul went again to Ephesus, and found about twelve disciples; *and he went into the synagogue, and spake boldly for the space of three months, disputing and persuading the things concerning the kingdom of* GOD. *But when divers were hardened, and believed not, but spake evil of that way before the multitude, he departed from them, and separated the disciples, disputing daily in the school of one Tyrannus. And this continued by the space of two years: so*

---

e The Sections are numbered for the convenience of reference.

f Acts xxvi. 12—18.

g Acts xviii. 18, 20.

Digitized by Google

that all they which dwelt in Asia heard the word of the LORD JESUS, *both Jews and Greeks.*"[h]

Paul, therefore, was about *three years* in Ephesus preaching the word, as he tells us himself;[i] and great numbers believed.[k]

6. *After these things were ended Paul purposed in the Spirit, when he had passed through Macedonia and Achaia, to go to Jerusalem, saying, After I have been there I must also see Rome. So he sent into Macedonia two of them that ministered unto him, Timothy and Erastus: but he himself stayed in Asia for a season.*[l]

7. While he remained yet a short time in that country, there was a great uproar produced by Demetrius, in consequence of the decline of his business of making shrines for the Heathen goddess Diana, from the numbers converted to GOD by the preaching of Paul. *And after the uproar was ceased, Paul called unto him the disciples and embraced them, and departed for to go into Macedonia*, as he had determined.

8. *And when he had gone over those parts, and had given them much exhortation, he came into Greece, and there abode three months. And when the Jews laid wait for him, as he was about to sail into Syria* (on his way to Jerusalem) *he purposed to return* THROUGH MACEDONIA: while his company (one of whom was Timothy) *going before*, (by water,) *tarried for* him *at Troas.*[m]

9. Having left Ephesus, and expecting never to return,[n] Paul discovered the utmost anxiety for the prosperity of the Church in that city. This is shown in that most interesting narration contained in the twentieth chapter of the Acts.

10. It is proposed to show from the Scripture:

1st. That in this state of anxiety for the welfare of that Church, Paul left Timothy in charge of it, with directions for his conduct towards all in it; and that those directions, contained in the first Epistle to Timothy, show that he exercised episcopal authority over the whole Church; the Presbyters being subject to his authority, as well as the Deacons.

2nd. That Timothy continued in charge of the Church at Ephesus five years and a half at least; how much longer being uncertain: and,

3rd. These points being established by scriptural statements, it will be clearly shown, from the testimony of those who immediately succeeded the Apostles in the care of the Church, and who like many of them sealed the truth with their blood, that Timothy's successors exercised the same authority.

11. And first, that Paul left Timothy, his constant companion for several years before,[o] in charge of the Church at Ephesus, with directions for his conduct towards all in it, which show that

---

h Acts xix. 7—10. i Acts xx. 31. k Acts xix. 11, 20.
l Acts xix. 21, 22. m Acts xx. 1—5. n Acts xx. 25.
o Acts xvi. 1—4; xvii. 14—16; xviii. 5; xix. 22; xx. 4, 5.

Digitized by Google

he exercised episcopal authority over Presbyters, Deacons, and people.

12. Paul, in his first Epistle to Timothy, says, *I besought thee* TO ABIDE STILL AT EPHESUS, *when I went into Macedonia, that thou mightest charge some, that they teach no other doctrine.*[p]

He tells him, *This charge I commit unto thee, Son Timothy, according to the prophecies which went before on thee,*[q] *that thou by them mightest war a good warfare.*[r] *I exhort,* THEREFORE, *that first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks be made for all men.*[s]

He proceeds to give him directions respecting the order of the Church,[t] and to guide him in the choice of proper persons for the offices of Presbyter or Bishop and Deacon;[u] and tells him, *These things write I unto thee, hoping to come unto thee shortly: but if I tarry long, that thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of* GOD, *which is the Church of the living* GOD, *the pillar and ground of the truth.*[v]

He directs him, if a Presbyter behave well, to honour him; if not, to rebuke him before all, that others also (that is, the rest[w] of them) may fear; charges him *before* GOD, *and the* LORD JESUS CHRIST, *and the elect angels,* to observe these things without preferring one before another, doing nothing by partiality; and closes this solemn charge respecting the government of the Elders, with warning him to take care whom he put into this office: *Lay hands suddenly on no man.*[x]

Finally, Paul charges Timothy in the following weighty words: *I give thee charge in the sight of* GOD, *who quickeneth all things, and before* CHRIST JESUS, *who before Pontius Pilate witnessed a good confession; that thou keep this commandment without spot, unrebukeable,* UNTIL THE APPEARING OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST.[y]

13. In these passages from the first Epistle to Timothy, written by Paul expressly for his direction in the regulation of the Church, are contained full evidence of ample episcopal authority. Timothy was to remain at Ephesus to regulate the Church, to restrain those who should preach false doctrine, to select proper persons for Presbyters and Deacons, to prove or try them,[z] to ordain such as were found worthy, to honour them if they behaved well, to rebuke them that sinned before all, that the rest might fear, and to continue in this charge until the coming of the LORD JESUS CHRIST. The episcopal powers which are

---

p 1 Tim. i. 3. q 1 Tim. iv. 14; 2 Tim. i. 6. r 1 Tim. i. 18. s 1 Tim. ii. 1.
t 1 Tim. iii. u 1 Tim. iii. v 1 Tim. iii. 14, 15.

w The word in our translation is *others, that* OTHERS *also may fear.* This is, however, much more indefinite than the original Greek. The words translated *others,* are 'οι λοιποι, (*reliqui—the rest,*) *that* THE REST *also may fear.* The proper Greek word for *others,* is 'ετεροι, or αλλοι; and one of these would have been used by the Apostle if he had intended to speak indefinitely of all other persons. Of the correctness of this, most men may readily inform themselves.

x 1 Tim. v. 17—22. y 1 Tim. vi. 13, 14. z 1 Tim. iii. 10.

Digitized by Google

most offensive to those who derive their ordination through Presbyters, are here plainly laid down; *viz.* the power exercised by Timothy of selecting; after sufficient proof, of ordaining; and of governing the clergy as well as the laity—and that for an unlimited time.

14. It is important to determine when this charge of the Church at Ephesus was given to Timothy, and there are a number of circumstances stated in the Acts, which, when compared, enable us to determine the time.

15. Paul says, he besought Timothy to abide still at Ephesus *when he* (Paul) *went into Macedonia.*[a]

It is related in the Acts of the Apostles, that Paul made two visits to Macedonia after the Church was established at Ephesus; and the account of his journeys is so particular and minute, from the time of his leaving Ephesus until the close of the narrative, that it is evident he did not make any other journey into Macedonia within the period embraced in that narrative. This will appear from the following statement.

16. After spending three years in Ephesus in establishing the Church,[b] he determined to go to Macedonia.[c] After the uproar, an account of which is related in Acts xix. 23—41, he executed his purpose of going into that country.[d] From Macedonia he went into Greece, and spent three months there.[e] From Greece, as he was about to sail into Syria, he determined *to return through Macedonia*, in order to avoid the Jews, who, he was informed, were lying in wait to kill him on his way to Syria,[f] leaving his company to go on towards Syria and wait for him at Troas, a sea-port town on the coast of Asia.[g] After passing through Macedonia, and continuing there until after the days of unleavened bread, he sailed from Philippi, a principal city of that country, and overtook his company at Troas.[h] After spending a week in Troas, Paul and his company pursued their way, and in a few days arrived at Miletus.[i] From Miletus he went by Coos, Rhodes, Patara, Tyre, Ptolemais, and Cæsarea to Jerusalem.[k] Soon after he arrived in Jerusalem he was arrested and imprisoned, carried thence to Cæsarea, and imprisoned there likewise, and after several examinations before Claudius Lysias, Felix, Portius Festus, and Agrippa, he appealed to Cæsar, and was sent in chains to Rome;[l] and at Rome, in prison, the history leaves him.[m]

17. It is manifest, therefore, that we have no account of Paul's having made any other than these two visits to Macedonia, after the Church was established at Ephesus, *viz.* one from Ephesus

---

a 1 Tim. i. 3. b Acts xix. 8, 10; xx. 31. c Acts xix. 21. d Acts xx. 1.
e Acts xx. 2, 3. f Acts xx. 3, g Acts xx. 5. h Acts xx. 6.
i Acts xx, 6—15. k Acts xxi. 1—15.
l Acts xxi. 27, 33; xxii. 24, 30: xxiii. 1, 10, 23, 35; xxiv. 1, 27: xxv. 2, 4, 9 10, 12, 27; xxvi. 1, 32; xxvii. xxviii. m Acts xxviii. 16, 30, 31.

Digitized by Google

to Macedonia,[n] and the other from Greece to Macedonia a few months afterwards, to avoid the Jews.[o]

18. On the first of these visits to Macedonia, he had sent before him *Timothy and Erastus; but he himself stayed in Asia for a season.*[p] It was not therefore at this time that Paul besought Timothy to remain at Ephesus; but on the second visit he made this earnest request of him: *viz.* while they were in Greece together, and Paul, to avoid the Jews, *was going* into Macedonia. The word translated *when I went*, is the present participle, πορευομενος, (*proficiscens*,) *journeying*. The passage, therefore, runs thus, *I, going into Macedonia*, (or *when going*) *besought thee to abide still at Ephesus.* The difference is not material, but the fact of the *present participle* being used, points most clearly to the precise meaning of the passage.

19. In his first Epistle to Timothy,[q] Paul says, I BESOUGHT *thee to abide still at Ephesus, when I went* (or *was going*) *into Macedonia.* The epistle was therefore written *after* that time; the verb *besought* being in the past tense.

20. In the same epistle,[r] Paul says, *These things write I unto thee,* HOPING TO COME UNTO THEE SHORTLY: *but if I tarry long, that thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of* GOD, *which is the Church of the living* GOD, *the pillar and ground of the truth.* This epistle was written, therefore, at a time when he expected soon to see Timothy. Timothy was then waiting at Troas, with the rest of the company, for Paul's return from Macedonia,[s] and Paul left Philippi in Macedonia *after the days of unleavened bread, and came unto them to Troas in five days.*[t]

21. The first Epistle to Timothy, therefore, was written *in Macedonia*, after Paul went there from Greece, and *before* he rejoined Timothy and the rest of his company at Troas.

22. Another passage in the same epistle, *Till I come, give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine,*[u] shows in the clearest manner that Paul was then expected, and that Timothy was waiting his arrival; and, considering that Timothy had consented to take charge of the Church at Ephesus, (as his subsequent situation shows,) there could not well be more suitable advice given him.

23. Some have supposed that Timothy was then in Ephesus: but this is totally inconsistent with the whole narrative and with Paul's own declaration.

The narrative shows that after Paul left Ephesus, to travel through Macedonia and Greece, to Jerusalem and Rome, he did not go to Ephesus, unless after being at Rome, and in that case, as will clearly be shown in the sequel of this Essay, at least five years passed before he was set at liberty, so as to have an opportunity of going to Ephesus.

n Acts xx. 1.
o Acts xx. 3, 6.
p Acts xix. 21, 22, and xx. 1.
q 1 Tim. i, 3.
r 1 Tim. iii. 14, 15.
s Acts xx. 5.
t Acts xx. 6.
u 1. Tim. iv. 13.

Digitized by Google

Add to this that Paul determined *to pass by Ephesus*, and himself told the Elders of Ephesus, at Miletus, a few days after he left Troas, that he knew that they should see his face no more,[v] showing in the plainest manner, that he had no idea, when he wrote the epistle to Timothy, a little before his arrival at Troas from Macedonia, of seeing Ephesus in a short time.

It was therefore not in Ephesus, that Paul expected to see Timothy shortly after writing that epistle; but in Troas, where the company, of which Timothy was one, were then waiting for Paul, and where Paul actually did see him shortly after.[w]

24. Paul and his company spent a week at Troas, after he rejoined them, and then pursuing his voyage towards Jerusalem, he arrived at Miletus, near Ephesus, and sent for the Elders of the Church in the latter city, in order to give them his last advice and charge.[x]

It is important to determine the time of this meeting also. In this there is no difficulty.

25. We are informed that Paul, after preaching till late, and sitting up all night talking with his friends, whom he was about on the morrow to leave forever,[y] left Troas in the morning to proceed on his way. His company sailed from Troas to Assos, another town on the coast not far off, he himself going on foot. As soon as he came up with them, they sailed to Mitylene; and the next day came over against Chios; and the next day arrived at Samos, an island separated by a narrow strait from the main land, and tarried at Trogyllium, a town on the main land opposite the island; and the next day they arrived at Miletus.[z]

26. The distance from Troas to Mitylene, judging from the map of ancient geography, is not as great as that from Mitylene to Chios, or from Chios to Samos. The two last distances having been traversed in one day each, the presumption is, that the first occupied the same time; the general course being the same, and therefore the wind equally favourable, and Paul showing on every occasion, in this voyage, the utmost anxiety to get to Jerusalem before the day of Pentecost. The whole voyage, therefore, occupied four days; and consequently, allowing another day for the messenger who sailed from Miletus to Ephesus, a shorter distance, by the map, than from Mitylene to Chios, or from Chios to Samos, only five days elapsed from the time of leaving Troas until the day the Elders left Ephesus to go to Miletus to see Paul.

27. To return to Timothy; he may have travelled from Troas to Ephesus by land or by sea.

28. If we suppose that he travelled by land, it was not possible, considering the directness of the route by sea, the much more indirect route by land, the much greater slowness of travelling by land than by water, and the distance from Troas to Ephesus,

---

v Acts xx. 16, 25. w Acts xx. 3, 6. x Acts xx. 5, 6, 17.
y Acts xx. 25. z Acts xx. 7—17.

Digitized by Google

extending over four and a half degrees of latitude, or at least four hundred miles, that Timothy could have arrived at Ephesus when the Elders left that city for Miletus—that is, in five days.

29. If any one should wish to know how the distance from Troas to Ephesus is ascertained to be four hundred miles, I answer; there are four and a half degrees of latitude between the two places, or at least two hundred and seventy geographical miles; indeed somewhat more, as the places do not lie exactly North and South from one another. To determine how many miles of road this would make, I had no better way than to take the distance between two of our towns in geographical miles, and by comparing this with the same distance in road miles, to ascertain the probable distance between Troas and Ephesus in the same. Thus, the distance between Boston and Baltimore, is about two hundred and eighty four geographical miles—the distance in road miles, that is to say, by the common computation, is four hundred and twenty one miles. The proportion two hundred and eighty four geographical to four hundred and twenty one road miles, gives for two hundred and seventy geographical miles, four hundred road miles between Troas and Ephesus.

30. Such a distance Timothy could not have travelled in five days. It would take a man ten or twelve days to travel it on horseback, without any allowance for interruptions, and few men do it even in that time. Therefore, Timothy could not have arrived at Ephesus at the time of this meeting between Paul and the Elders at Miletus.

31. If, on the other hand, we suppose Timothy to have travelled by water, he must have made the voyage in company with Paul; and in every point of view this is the most probable. They had been many years constant companions; (§11) they had designed to sail together from Greece to Asia; and when this design was frustrated, and Paul returned through Macedonia to avoid the Jews, who were lying in wait to kill him, Timothy went on with the others to Troas, and waited there until he rejoined them.[a] The company spent a week at Troas,[b] and then proceeded on their way to the very neighbourhood where Timothy was also to go.[c] It was nearer by sea than by land: the journey could therefore be made more speedily, more pleasantly, even if Paul were not on board; much more with him for a companion. In fact, the pleasure of such a trip, with an old and valued friend, taking his leave for an unknown length of time, would induce most men to go considerably further round, much more to take a better, shorter, and pleasanter way. Add to all these considerations, that we have no account of Timothy's leaving the company at Troas, and it is in the highest degree probable that he did not leave them there; and, consequently, that he was present at the interview between Paul and the Elders.

a Acts xx, 5. b Acts xx, 6. c Acts xx, 13, 17.

Digitized by Google

32. If, however, he was not there at the time, it is manifest he could not have arrived by land before they left Ephesus and consequently, in either case, these Elders were in the Church at Ephesus before he took charge.

33. This view of the case is strongly confirmed by the consideration of the improbability that Paul would have laboured three years to establish this Church, and, although he showed great attachment to it, and great anxiety for its welfare, have left it, never expecting to see it again, without bringing it to proper order, and placing it on the best footing in his power; and the more especially when we recollect how careful he was TO ORDAIN ELDERS IN EVERY CHURCH,[d] long before this.[e] Such a supposition would be totally inconsistent with every trait in his character. Ardent, indefatigable, with such a talent for order and method as is displayed in his Epistles, and particularly in that to Timothy, he could not have suffered the Church to be without order for three years. He must have arranged its affairs long before he left it, and *ordained Elders here as in other Churches.*

34. The same view is confirmed likewise by the whole tenor of the address to the Elders of Ephesus. Paul reminds them, in very touching language, of the manner in which he had devoted himself to instructing them, and makes a strong appeal to their feelings, to induce them to be faithful; telling them that he never should see them again. He *therefore* urges them to *take care to feed the Church over which the* HOLY GHOST *had made them overseers;* and he warns them to be faithful, *because*[f] he knew that some among them would thereafter *arise* and *speak perverse things.* His whole object evidently was, *to excite them* to perform the duty which had been committed to them (of *feeding the Church*, an expression unquestionably relating to *the doctrine they should teach;*) and *to warn them* that he apprehended some of their ownselves would thereafter *arise speaking perverse things*, which shows that he had discovered in some of them a tendency to do this, in the course of his acquaintance with them. The whole tenor of the address shows, that Paul was intimately acquainted with these Elders, in consequence of his three years residence in Ephesus.

35. It is evident, moreover, from a passage in the first Epistle to Timothy, that Paul had this very state of things in the Church at Ephesus in view when he wrote that Epistle. He says, *I besought thee to abide still at Ephesus, when I went to Macedonia*, THAT THOU MIGHTEST CHARGE SOME THAT THEY TEACH NO OTHER DOCTRINE. He must have had some certain persons in view; and if we look at the exact meaning of the word translated *some*, we shall see at once the correctness of

d Acts xiv. 23. e Acts xviii. 11, 18, 20—23; xix. 8, 10; xx. 31.

f The original word translated *for*, in the passage FOR *I know this*, &c. [Acts xx. 29,] is *γαρ, nam, enim*, for; *igitur*, therefore; *quippe*, because: it is a conjunction relating to causes, *conjunctio causalis.*

Digitized by Google

this idea. The word is τινα, and signifies QUIDAM, *some certain persons:* it is also used indefinitely to signify *somebody*, *some or other*, *indefinitum* ALIQUIS. Paul evidently must have used the word in the *definite* sense: he could not have meant to tell Timothy to charge somebody or other, but to charge *some certain persons*, whom he had in view, *not to teach any other doctrine.*

36. It may be added here, that the very expression of Paul to Timothy, *that thou mightest charge some* TO TEACH *no other doctrine*, implies that there were *teachers then* in Ephesus. He had, therefore, these very *teachers* in view when he wrote the instructions to Timothy; and afterwards calling them all together, he himself warns them of this very evil, which he had before directed Timothy to charge them to abstain from.

37. The conclusion drawn from the impossibility of Timothy's having reached Ephesus, when the Elders were sent for to meet Paul at Miletus, (§32) is, therefore, confirmed by the latter considerations, (§33—36) and it is manifest that there were Elders in the Church at Ephesus when Timothy was appointed to take charge of it.

38. We have now seen that Paul, after spending three years in planting and building up the Church at Ephesus, being about to go to Rome, besought Timothy to abide in Ephesus in charge of the Church, with authority over all in it, including the Presbyters:

That Paul on this occasion wrote, for his instruction in the government of the Church, his first epistle to him, while in Macedonia, and a little before rejoining him at Troas, when Timothy was waiting for him:

That Paul left Troas for Jerusalem, where he meant to spend a short time before going to Rome; stopped at Miletus; and sent for the Elders of the Church at Ephesus; before Timothy could possibly have reached that city: and, therefore,

That there were Elders at Ephesus when Timothy was appointed to take charge of that Church.

39. We have moreover seen that Timothy had authority to exercise in the Church ample episcopal powers; to select the Presbyters and Deacons, to prove or try them, and on proper trial to ordain them, if they proved faithful to honour them, if otherwise to rebuke any that sinned *before all, that the rest might fear* the like treatment in case of improper conduct. Indeed, so far from the Presbyters being on a footing of equality with him in power, more is said about keeping them in order than any body else—a circumstance which unquestionably may be explained by the knowledge Paul had of the perverse disposition of some of them, which he tells them of in his address to them at Miletus.

40. The difference between the character and office of Timothy and the Elders, will appear in a striking point of view, on

Digitized by Google

comparing the commission given to him,[g] with the address to them.

To the Elders there is not one word said about ruling, the sole charge to them being to feed the flock over which the HOLY GHOST had made them overseers, and to avoid teaching perverse doctrines *to draw away disciples after them.*

To Timothy the power is given, to restrain those who teach false doctrine; he is the source of authority to preach; (*lay hands suddenly on no man,*) he is, to the Presbyters, the source of honour, the punisher of offences, a praise to them that did well, a terror to them who should do evil. He was in short the *overseer* of the whole—the Bishop of the Church at Ephesus.

41. Here, then, we undoubtedly have three distinct orders of ministers in the Church. Timothy over all—the source of ministerial authority in that Church; the Presbyters and Deacons selected and ordained by him; and these, as well as those who were in the Church when he took charge, subject to his rebuke if found acting improperly; the Presbyters feeding the Church, teaching the people: and the Deacons, though not mentioned in express words in the Epistle to Timothy, as preaching, yet in other places as preaching and baptizing.[h]

42. It has been said that Timothy exercised these powers in quality of an Evangelist; as it is said, *But watch thou in all things, endure afflictions,* DO THE WORK OF AN EVANGELIST, *make full proof of thy ministry.*[i]

It is answered,

1. The objection embraces the admission that Timothy had superior authority.

2. *Evangelist* was not the name of an order of ministers. *The* DEACON *Philip was an Evangelist.*[k]

The word *Evangelist* is so nearly the same as *evangelium,* (the gospel,) as to make it evident that an Evangelist was, in general, one who *preached the gospel,* who spread the good news. It bears the same relation to *evangelium,* that the old English word *Gospeller* does to *gospel:* and hence it was that the deacon Philip was called an Evangelist.

43. It is objected as a difficulty in the way of receiving this doctrine, that the Presbyters are called Overseers or Bishops. They are so called; overseers *over the flock:* but that name did not point out their *powers.* The extent of the oversight which they had in the Church is expressly stated. They were to take heed *to feed the Church,* and to *avoid false doctrine.* (§34.) No other power or authority is mentioned, than *feeding the flock:* and notwithstanding this *name,* there was one over them, from whom they derived their ordination, and who honoured them or rebuked them according to their deserts. He was *their overseer*—their Bishop.

---

g See §12, 13, 39.
h Acts vi. 9, 10; viii. 5, 12, 35, 38, 40.
i 2 Tim. iv. 5.
k Acts xxi. 8.

Digitized by Google

44. If it be asked, Why then was not Timothy *called* a Bishop, the answer is given in the plain statement of the fact, that those who bore the relation he did to the Church, were *then* called *Apostles:* and that *afterwards* it became their practice to use the title of *Bishop* instead of that of *Apostle*, and to distinguish the Elders by the title *Presbyter* alone.

45. With regard to the assertion that those who had the charge of Churches were originally called Apostles, we find that Paul gives that title, in his second Epistle to the Corinthians,[l] to Titus and another who was with him. In our English Testament the word is translated *messengers;* but the word in the Greek is αποςολοι, *apostles*. This word, αποςολοι, signifying *messengers*, is used to designate *the messengers of* GOD sent to preach the gospel. It is not, therefore, proper to translate the word in this case *messengers* merely—seeing that these men really were *messengers of* GOD; of one of whom it is said in the 18th verse of the same chapter, that *his praise was in the gospel throughout all the Churches*, and of both that they were *the glory of* CHRIST.[m]

Epaphroditus is also called *messenger* in the English Testament;[n] but the word in the original is the same, (αποςολον, in the singular number,) and the strong words used with it, show that he was what he is called in the original, *the Apostle* of the Philippians: *Yet I supposed it necessary to send to you Epaphroditus*, MY BROTHER AND COMPANION IN LABOUR (assistant or colleague) AND FELLOW-SOLDIER, *but* YOUR APOSTLE, *and he that ministered to my wants.*

46. It may be objected to this, that Epaphroditus carried to Paul the contribution of the Philippians, and therefore he was *their messenger* literally. But this was what Paul himself frequently did—if carrying a contribution is evidence that the bearer is not an Apostle although so called, and called by Paul *colleague*, or assistant and fellow-soldier, Paul must have been merely a messenger. In those times of persecution, when the leading men of the Church were continually liable to be arrested and carried to Rome, while prisoners there they were visited by their brethren, colleagues and fellow-soldiers, who governed the Churches in the countries around the Mediterranean sea, and they very commonly carried them something to render their imprisonment comfortable. Thus, between forty and fifty years after the death of Paul, Ignatius Bishop of Antioch, was carried to Rome, and during his long journey, Onesimus Bishop of the Ephesians, Damas Bishop of the Magnesians, with two Presbyters and a Deacon, and Polybius Bishop of the Trallians, went to attend to him and comfort him on his way.[o] These Bishops in these cases carried the contributions of their respective Churches; but this did not make them mere messengers.

47. The objection to considering as Apostles, any but the

l 2 Cor. viii. 23. m Ibid. n Philip. ii. 25. o See the Appendix.

Digitized by Google

twelve and Paul, and to reject the claim of others whom Paul in his epistles calls *Apostles*, leads to the rejection of the claim of Barnabas likewise. Accordingly, Dr. Miller attempts to show that he also is but *a messenger* of the Churches.[p] It has however been satisfactorily shown that Barnabas was *an Apostle* (p. 206 ss. of this volume,) and Paul himself calls him *an Apostle* in the following passage in which he is speaking of his own claim to the title of an Apostle, *My answer to them that do examine me, is this: Have we not power to eat and to drink? Have we not power to lead about a sister, a wife, as other Apostles, and as the brethren of the* LORD, *and Cephas? Or I only and* BARNABAS *have not* WE *power to forbear working?*[q] The objection to Epaphroditus, Titus, and others whom Paul calls *Apostles*, is equally invalid.

48. The assertion that those persons who occupied the chief station in the Church and were originally called *Apostles*, were afterwards called *Bishops*, is of such a nature that it can be shown to be true or false only by evidence, and the appeal therefore is to evidence. This, in the very nature of things, must be drawn from the writings of those who succeeded the Apostles in the care and charge of the Church. These men are the best witnesses that possibly could be thought of; men who spent their lives in the service of the Church, devoted to GOD; men who chose *rather to suffer affliction with the people of* GOD, *than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season;* men who *had trial of cruel mockings and scourgings, yea, moreover, of bonds and imprisonment;* men who not only *hazarded their lives for the name of our* LORD JESUS CHRIST, which the Apostles, Elders, and brethren at Jerusalem speak of as a high recommendation of Barnabas and Paul,[r] but who deliberately yielded up their lives to a violent death by the sword, by fire, and by wild beasts, rather than *deny the* LORD *that bought them.* Let any man read the Martyrdom of Ignatius, and the third to the eighth Sections of his Epistle to the Romans, in the Appendix to these pages, and then, laying his hand on his heart and looking up to GOD, say that Ignatius is not to be credited as a witness respecting the order of the Church in his time.

49. Ignatius was an old man when, for his steadfast refusal to deny the SAVIOUR, he was thrown into the amphitheatre at Rome and devoured by lions. This occurred in the year 116 of the Christian æra, and about forty-six years after the death of Paul. He was about forty years in the service of the Church, and consequently he was in that service almost the whole interval between Paul's death and his own. He was a disciple of the Apostle John, and as the latter lived till about the year 96, he died only twenty years before Ignatius.

50. In his Epistles, written in the year 116, on his way to

---

p MILLER'S *Letters*, p. 59, [p. 36, 2d *ed.*]

q 1 Corinth. ix. 3—6.

r Acts xv. 25, 26.

Digitized by Google

Rome to suffer martyrdom, Ignatius speaks very frequently of all the orders of ministers. He speaks of the Bishop in the singular number in every instance, and in such terms as carry conviction to the mind that there was but one in a Church at one time. He attributes to him powers and authority fully equal to that exercised by the Apostles. The Bishop, according to Ignatius, was the source of authority in the Church; without his approbation nothing was to be done; in his absence the flock had no other shepherd but GOD.[s] Timothy was no more, Timothy was no less, in Ephesus. According to Ignatius, the Presbyter had no longer the title of Bishop: but he was no less than the Presbyter of Ephesus under Timothy. He was the very same in every duty, but derived all his authority from the Bishop. The same is true of the Deacon. These all, according to Ignatius, were still, as in Ephesus, *ministers in the word*. There was no change whatever in the constitution of the Church. The principal minister had adopted another name, perfectly appropriate, *Bishop* or Overseer of the Church: and this, which in the beginning belonged to the second order of ministers, they no longer retained; but with the name of Presbyter, they retained all the duties of the Presbyter of Ephesus.

51. It is, moreover, admitted by the Presbyterians, that Timothy exercised authority over the Elders in the Church at Ephesus; but they allege that it ceased with him. Of this, however, there is not the slightest evidence. The Scriptures say nothing about it. To the fathers only can they go for evidence, and they are decidedly against them. Ignatius, in his Epistle to the Ephesians, speaks of Onesimus their Bishop—of course such a Bishop as he continually alludes to—exercising all the power that Timothy did.

52. It may also be remarked that the manner in which Ignatius speaks of the three orders of ministers, shows that the change in the name of two of them had been made some time: for there is not, I think, one syllable of allusion *to the change* in all his epistles: it was therefore not a recent one; and the whole tenor of the epistles shows that it had become the settled practice of the Church..

53. In these epistles, then, we observe the fact, that that man who exercised the authority in the Church, which the Apostles in their lifetime exercised, was called *Bishop*.

54. It is also to be observed, that there is only one Bishop spoken of in one Church at a time, but many Presbyters; *Bishop* always in the singular, *Presbyters* always in the plural; and often mentioned together, *the* Bishop and Presbyters, or the Bishop and *his* Presbytery or council of Presbyters,[t] so as to show, as perfectly as language can show, the difference between them.

---

s Sect. 9th of the Epistle to the Romans.

t Sect. 4th of the Epistle to the Philadelphians.

Digitized by Google

55. The same state of things existed in one of the Churches to which Ignatius wrote an epistle, in which he, for obvious reasons, was not led to say any thing of their ministers: I mean the Romans. This we learn from a passage from Irenæus.[u]

"The Apostles, founding and instructing that Church, (the Church of Rome,) delivered to *Linus* the *Episcopate; Anacletus succeeded* him; after him *Clemens* obtained the *Episcopate* from the Apostles. To *Clement* succeeded *Evaristus;* to him *Alexander;* then *Sixtus;* and after him *Telesphorus;* then *Hugynus;* after him *Pius;* then *Anicetus;* and when *Soter* had succeeded *Anicetus*, then *Eleutherius* had the Episcopate in the twelfth place. By *this succession,*[v] that tradition in the Church, and publication of the truth, which is from the Apostles, is come to us."

This passage, extraordinary as it may seem, with the words marked in italics, is taken from MILLER's *Letters*, p. 151, [p. 98, 2d *ed.*] It will be noticed again hereafter.

56. Others of the fathers state distinctly that Timothy was Bishop of the Ephesians, as appears from the following quotations from Dr. BOWDEN's *Letters to Dr. Miller*, Vol. I. p. 257, [Vol. I. p. 124, 2d *ed.*]

"1. From a fragment of a treatise by Polycrates Bishop of Ephesus, towards the close of the second century. This fragment is preserved in Photius' *Bibliotheca*, and quoted by Archbishop Usher in his *Discourse on Episcopacy*. In that fragment it is said, that 'Timothy was ordained Bishop of Ephesus by *the great Paul*. 2. It appears from Eusebius, who says, 'it is recorded in history that Timothy was the first Bishop of Ephesus.' 3. From the *Commentary* under the name of Ambrose. He says, 'Being now ordained a Bishop, Timothy was instructed by the *epistle* of Paul how to dispose and order the Church of GOD.' 4. From Epiphanius, who says, 'The Apostle, speaking to Timothy, being then a Bishop, advises him thus —*Rebuke not an Elder*,' &c. 5. By Jerome, who in his tract *Of Ecclesiastical Writers*, says, 'Timothy was ordained Bishop of the Ephesians *by the blessed Paul*.' 6. By Chrysostom, who says, 'Paul directs Timothy to fulfil his ministry, being then a Bishop; for that he was a Bishop appears from Paul's writing thus to him, *Lay hands suddenly on no man*.' 7. By Leontius Bishop of Magnesia, one of the fathers in the great council of Chalcedon, who declared, that 'from Timothy to their time, there had been twenty-six Bishops of the Church of Ephesus.' 8. By Primasius, who says, 'Timothy was a Bishop; and had the gift of prophecy with his ordination to the episcopate.' 9. By Theophylact, who gives this reason for St. Paul's writing to Timothy, 'because that in a Church newly constituted, it was not easy to inform a Bishop of all things incident to his place by word of mouth;' and in his *Commentary* on the fourth chapter of the first Epistle, he styles Timothy, *Bishop*. 10. By Oecumenius, who, on these words, *I beseught thee to abide still at Ephesus*, gives this gloss—'He ordained him Bishop.'"

In remarking on Dr. Miller's omitting the striking passages in

u IRENÆUS, Book III. Chap. iii.

v [In Dr. MILLER's 2d *ed.* this reads thus:—"by this appointment and instruction that tradition," &c.—a DIRECT FALSIFICATION of the passage! See the Latin of Irenæus in the Appendix.]

Digitized by Google

favour of Episcopacy, in his quotations from the fathers, Dr. Bowden says:

"Thus, you do not exhibit the following pointed testimonies from Hilary. 'The Bishop is the chief; though every Bishop is a Presbyter, yet every Presbyter is not a Bishop.' He declares that 'James was constituted Bishop of Jerusalem by the Apostles, and that the Apostles were Bishops.' He affirms, that 'Timothy and Titus, and the Angels of the Asiatic Churches were Bishops'—Bishops in the appropriate sense of the word. He says, 'In the Bishop all orders are contained, because he is the *Prince* or *Chief* of the Priests.' He affirms that 'the Bishop is the *Vicegerent* of CHRIST, and represents his *Person*;' and that 'he decreed every Church should be governed by one Bishop, even as all things proceed from one GOD THE FATHER.' And in several other places this author affirms, 'that in a Church there were several Presbyters and Deacons, but never more than one Bishop, even in the Apostle's times.'"[w]

He asks Dr. Miller:

"Why, Sir, did you not inform your Christian brethren that Theodore maintains, that those who had the appropriate title of Bishop in his day, and for ages before, were called *Apostles* in the first age of the Church? Why did you not lay before them the following passage? Epaphroditus was called the Apostle of the Philippians, because he was entrusted with the episcopal government, as being their Bishop. For those now called *Bishops*, were anciently called *Apostles*; but in process of time, the name of *Apostle* was left to those who were truly Apostles, and the name of *Bishop* was restrained to those who were anciently called Apostles; Thus Epaphroditus was the Apostle of the Philippians, Titus of the Cretans, and Timothy of the Asiatics.'"[x]

Here, therefore, we have a perfectly satisfactory account of the reason why the names *Bishop* and *Presbyter* were no longer applied to the same office as they had been in the Scripture—the name of *Apostle* was dropped—and the name of *Bishop* was now '*restrained to those who were anciently called* APOSTLES.'

"There is another writer who was contemporary with Theodoret, that deserves to be noticed—I mean Isidore, Bishop of Pelusium, of whom Mosheim gives the following character. 'He was a man of uncommon learning and sanctity. A great number of his epistles are yet extant, and discover more piety, genius, erudition, and wisdom, than are to be found in the voluminous productions of many other writers.' Isidore says, 'The Bishops succeeded the Apostles—they were constituted through the whole world in the place of the Apostles.' He then says, that 'Aaron, the high priest, *was* what a Bishop *is*,' and that 'Aaron's sons prefigured the Presbyters.'"[y]

57. Having thus established, by abundant evidence drawn from Scripture, that Timothy exercised all the powers of a Bishop in the Church at Ephesus, the Presbyters and Deacons deriving their authority from him, and being subject to his superintendence and government, receiving from him honour when honour

w See p. 37 of Bowden's Letters, Vol. I. [p. 19, of 2d *ed.*]
x See p. 41 of the same. [p. 21, 2d *ed.*]
y See p. 46 of the same. [p. 23, 2d *ed.*]

Digitized by Google

was due, and rebuke before all when deserved, in order that the rest might be influenced by fear of punishment to avoid like offences; and that the fathers who succeeded the Apostles in the care of the Church, called Timothy Bishop of Ephesus; it is proposed in the next place to show that he continued in that charge, certainly *five years and a half;* and longer, but how much longer is uncertain.

58. Paul in his first Epistle to Timothy gives him charge *until the appearing of our* LORD JESUS CHRIST; which is evidently for an unlimited time.

When the second Epistle to Timothy was written, he was still in Ephesus. This is not questioned, and appears evident from several circumstances.

1. Paul in his first Epistle, relative to the affairs of Ephesus, speaks of Hymeneus having *made shipwreck of faith;*[z] and in the second Epistle,[a] speaks of the same person as still being in the way of the truth, *saying that the resurrection is past already, and overthrowing the faith of some.*

He also speaks in the first Epistle of Alexander *making shipwreck of faith;*[b] and in the second tells Timothy to beware of him.[c]

2. In the second Epistle he informs Timothy that Onesiphorus WHEN HE WAS IN ROME *sought him out diligently;* and adds *in how many things he ministered unto me* AT EPHESUS, THOU KNOWEST VERY WELL;[d] and towards the close of the Epistle he says, *salute Prisca and Aquila,* AND THE HOUSEHOLD OF ONESIPHORUS."[e] The former of these passages shows that Onesiphorus was an inhabitant of Ephesus who ministered to Paul during the long residence of himself and Timothy in that town; and the latter that Timothy was his fellow-townsman, because Paul desires him to salute his household.

59. It being thus established that the first Epistle to Timothy was written a few weeks before he took charge of the Church at Ephesus, (§21, 22) and that he was still at Ephesus when the second was written; (§58) he must, during the intermediate time, have governed the Church in that city. This interval was above five years and a half, of which positive evidence shall now be stated from Scripture: and very strong evidence, that a longer time elapsed.

60. That the second Epistle to Timothy was written *above five years* after the first, is completely established by the following considerations.

61. We have seen that Paul wrote his first Epistle to Timothy in Macedonia, immediately before his voyage to Jerusalem and Rome. (§21) From Philippi in Macedonia he sailed to Troas, remained there a week, went on to Miletus, and would not visit Ephesus, because he was anxious to reach Jerusalem by the day

---

z 1 Tim. i. 19, 20. a 2 Tim. ii. 17, 18. b 1 Tim. i. 20.
c 2 Tim. iv. 15. d 2 Tim. i. 16, 17, 18. e 2 Tim. iv. 19.

Digitized by Google

of Pentecost.[f] From Miletus he passed on to Jerusalem.[g] In this city he was imprisoned, in consequence of a clamour raised against him by the Jews of Asia, and confined two years by Felix the Governor of Judea.[h] Having appealed to Cæsar,[i] he was at length sent to Rome.[k]

As he went to Jerusalem to the feast of Pentecost, which was in the spring of the year, and was imprisoned by Felix *two years*, and sent to Rome by Festus soon after his entrance on the government, it must have been at least the summer of the *third year* when he left Judea for Rome.

The voyage to Rome was interrupted by various accidents, and by shipwreck on the coast of the island of Melita, now called Malta.[l] It was then cold weather,[m] and Paul and the ship's company wintered in the island, and in the spring of the year arrived at Rome.[n] Three years, therefore, had now elapsed since Paul left Timothy in charge of the Church at Ephesus.

Paul having arrived at Rome in the spring, was suffered to hire a house and dwell with a soldier to guard him;[o] and he continued two whole years *in his own hired house, and received all that came in unto him, preaching the kingdom of* GOD, *and teaching those things which concern the* LORD JESUS CHRIST, *with all confidence*, NO MAN FORBIDDING HIM.[p]

62. The history of Paul contained in the Acts, here closes.—How much longer he continued to preach in Rome we do not know. We know, however, that after a time he was brought into difficulties with the Emperor, perhaps in consequence of the conversion of some of his family which we know took place.[q] The time of his departure drawing nigh, he wrote to Timothy the second time,[r] telling him he greatly desired to see him,[s] and begging him to visit him, and to endeavour to come to him before winter.[t] If he was able to effect this, above five years and a half had elapsed from the time that Paul left Timothy in charge of the Church at Ephesus; viz. *two years* while he was imprisoned by Felix; *one year* spent partly in Judea in prison after Festus was made governor, and partly on the voyage to Rome, including the winter spent in Melita or Malta; *two years* spent by Paul in Rome in his own hired house, and *half a year* between the spring and winter, when Timothy was intreated to visit him; besides the time that elapsed between the close of the history in the Acts and the first and second trial of Paul.[u] Five years and a half are certain; and there are some circumstances which render it very probable that the time was considerably longer.

---

f Acts xx. 6—16.
g Acts xxi. 1—17.
h Acts xxi. 33; xxiii. 10, 35; xxiv. 27.
i Acts xxv. 10—12.
k Acts xxvii. 1, &c.
l Acts xxvii. 7—44.
m Acts xxvii. 12; xxviii. 2, 3.
n Acts xxviii. 11—14.
o Acts xxviii. 16.
p Acts xxviii. 30, 31.
q Philippians iv. 22.
r 2 Tim. iv. 6, 16.
s 2 Tim. i. 4.
t 2 Tim. iv. 9, 21.
u 2 Tim. iv. 16.

Digitized by Google

63. For instance, it is by no means certain that this epistle was written in the beginning of the third year of Paul's stay in Rome. In consequence of no charge against him having been sent to Rome by the Jews, he was allowed to preach undisturbed for two years. Luke, who wrote the account, continued with Paul, and is mentioned in almost every one of his epistles written from Rome,[v] and if there had been any probability of an immediate change—any probability of liberty or immediate death, he would not have closed his history with such a statement of his quiet state. His silence shows that things were likely to remain for some time as they were. After this, but how long afterwards we are not informed, Paul was called to account: and from what he writes to Timothy in his second epistle, viz. 'AT MY FIRST ANSWER *no man stood with me, but all men forsook me*,[w] we may fairly infer that he had then been called to account more than once. If we consider the time which probably elapsed, after the close of the history in the Acts, before the proceedings against Paul commenced, the time which elapsed between his first and second trial, the length of time required to make the voyage to Ephesus with the letter to Timothy, it is evident that a considerably longer time elapsed than that which we have actually proved: but the time expressly stated in the Acts amounts to full five years and a half.

64. The foregoing observations proceed upon the supposition that Paul was put to death not long after the close of his history in the Acts. But there was in the ancient Church a tradition that he was set at liberty after the close of that history, and again imprisoned at Rome some time afterwards. This tradition is supported by exceedingly strong evidence in some of the Epistles: indeed such as cannot be controverted: and, consequently, the unknown length of time during which he was at liberty, must be added to the five years already proved to have passed between the writing of the first and second Epistles; and, therefore, to the length of time during which Timothy had charge of the Church in Ephesus.

65. In the second Epistle to Timothy we find the following passage, *Erastus abode at Corinth;* BUT TROPHIMUS HAVE I LEFT AT MILETUS SICK.[x]

66. When Paul wrote this second Epistle to Timothy, the time of his departure was at hand,[y] he having been more than once before the Roman tribunals.[z] If this Epistle was written during his first imprisonment in Rome, he had, when he wrote it, been *in confinement* above five years, (§61—63,) and consequently could not have been at Miletum, to have left Trophimus there, *after he was arrested in Jerusalem and carried to Rome.*

67. This occurrence must, therefore, have taken place, either

---

v Colossians iv. 14; Philemon 24; 2 Tim. iv. 11,
w 2 Tim. iv. 16.
x 2 Tim. iv. 20.
y 2 Tim. iv. 6.
z 2 Tim. iv. 16.

Digitized by Google

before his arrest in Jerusalem, or *after having been discharged* from confinement at Rome.

68. It could not have occurred before the first Epistle to Timothy was written.

1. If it had, Paul would have mentioned it in that Epistle.

2. The first Epistle was written a few weeks before St. Paul set out from Macedonia to go to Jerusalem, (§21) and the second Epistle must have been written above five years afterwards, even upon the supposition that Paul was confined but once in Rome. (§61—63)—If Trophimus had been left sick at Miletum before the first Epistle was written, Paul certainly would not have mentioned it above five years afterwards, in such a manner as he has. If it had been mentioned so long afterwards, it would have been for some special reason which would have been stated; whereas it received only a passing notice, in few words, as if a late occurrence.

3. Paul, when he wrote the first Epistle, had lately left Ephesus, where he had spent three years. (§5, 6, 10, 15, 21.) From Ephesus he went northward, about the time of Pentecost,[a] to Macedonia through Troas,[b] turning his back upon Miletus which is near Ephesus to the southward. In Macedonia he spent some time, and went thence to Greece;[c] and spent three months there, and returned to Macedonia;[d] and thence he sailed, after the days of unleavened bread, a few weeks before Pentecost, in the year following that in which he left Ephesus, to Troas, where Timothy was waiting for him,[e] after the first Epistle was written. (§21.) Of course Paul was not at Miletus for four years at least, including the time of his residence at Ephesus, before the first Epistle was sent to Timothy, which was obviously written in consequence of Paul's determination to leave Ephesus, and Timothy's consent to abide there still.[f]

69. For these reasons, this occurrence could not have happened before the first Epistle was written.

70. Neither was Paul at Miletus more than once between the time in which he wrote the first Epistle to Timothy and his arrest in Jerusalem. The first Epistle, it has been shown, was written a few weeks before Paul set out on his voyage to Jerusalem, from Philippi in Macedonia. (§21.) In five days from that time he saw Timothy, and spent a week with him in Troas,[g] and in four days after that he arrived at Miletus on his way to Jerusalem. (§25, 26.) In the latter city he was arrested and sent to Rome, and there confined, so that he could not have been at Miletus, except this time, after writing the first Epistle and before his arrest in Jerusalem. It was not, however, on that visit to Miletus that Paul left Trophimus there sick; because the latter went to Jerusalem with him, and was the cause of his being arrested a few days after his arrival; the Jews being excited to violence by the supposition that Paul had carried him, (Tro-

a 1 Corinth. xvi. 8. b 2 Corinth. ii. 12, 13. c Acts xx. 2. d Acts xx. 3.
e Acts xx. 5, 6. f 1 Tim. i. 3. g Acts xx. 6.

Digitized by Google

phimus) an Ephesian, into the temple, because they had seen them together in the city.[h]

71. Paul, therefore, did not leave Trophimus sick in Miletum, before his arrest in Jerusalem; so that this occurrence must have taken place after his confinement in Rome mentioned in the Acts, (§67) and he must have been set at liberty after the close of that narrative.

72. This is still further confirmed by the following consideration. While a prisoner in Rome, Paul was visited by a number of persons from different Churches, who carried him presents to enable him to live comfortably in confinement. Epaphroditus was one of these, from Philippi.[i] Timothy also visited him—and it would have been very extraordinary if he had not, when others were so doing, if we consider the long intimacy and friendship between them. Now it is evident that Paul would not have mentioned his leaving Trophimus sick at Miletum, in a letter to Timothy written *after* this visit, if that circumstance occurred several years *before* the visit, as must have been the case if it occurred before his imprisonment. It must then have occurred after Timothy's visit to Rome, and consequently Paul must have been set at liberty, or he could not have been at Miletum to leave Trophimus there.

73. It may possibly be alleged by some, on a slight examination of the subject, that the second Epistle to Timothy was not written after his visit to Rome, but that it was written before the visit, and was the cause of it. Let us examine this.

74. While Timothy was in Rome his name was joined with Paul's in his addresses to several Churches.

Paul and Timothy to the Philippians, was written from Rome, as is evident from this passage: *So that my bonds in* CHRIST *are manifest in all the palace and in all other places*:[k] also from this: *All the saints salute you, chiefly they that are of Cæsar's household.*[l]

Paul and Timothy to the Colossians, was also written from Rome, as appears from the following passages: *Aristarchus my fellow-prisoner, saluteth you:—Remember my bonds.*[m]

Paul and Timothy also wrote to Philemon from Rome, as appears from the address: *Paul, a prisoner of* JESUS CHRIST, &c.[n] His being a prisoner is also mentioned in the 9th, 10th, and 23rd verses.

75. In the Epistle to the Colossians and in that to Philemon, Epaphras, Luke, Aristarchus, Marcus, and Demas are mentioned as sending salutations.[o] The former Epistle was sent by Tychicus and Onesimus:[p] the latter being of a private nature, and particularly concerning Onesimus, was committed to his charge.[q] The latter was addressed to Archippus as well as to Philemon,[r] and in the former there was a special message to him (Archippus) respecting the ministry;[s] therefore Archippus, and conse-

h Acts xxi. 29. i Philip. iv. 18. k Philip. i. 13. l Philip. iv. 22.
m Coloss. iv. 10, 18. n Philemon l. o Coloss. iv. 10, 12, 14; Philem. 23, 24.
p Coloss. iv. 7, 9. q Philemon 12. r Philemon 2. s Coloss. iv. 17.

Digitized by Google

quently Philemon, lived in Colosse. Written by the same persons, to different persons in the same town, by the hands of the same persons, these Epistles were written from the same place, and, therefore, the proof in each case, that the Epistle was written from Rome during Paul's confinement there, is proof in both.

76. Demas is mentioned in both these Epistles as greeting the persons to whom they were addressed;[t] but in the second Epistle to Timothy, Demas is mentioned as having *forsaken* Paul, *having loved this present world.*[u] The second Epistle to Timothy was, therefore, written after the joint Epistles of Paul and Timothy to the Colossians and to Philemon; consequently, after Timothy had returned to Ephesus and left Paul in confinement at Rome.

77. Further strong confirmation of the truth of the tradition of the Church, that Paul was set at liberty after the close of his history in the Acts, is derived from the following circumstances taken in connexion.

The Jews sent no charge against Paul to Rome.[v] In consequence of this he remained undisturbed in confinement in his own house for two years, and preached to all that went to see him, no man forbidding him, and the history closes with this account of his undisturbed state.[w] During this quiet state of things, or soon after, the Epistles to the Philippians, &c. were written, in which Paul expresses himself thus: *And having this confidence, I know that I shall abide and continue with you all,* &c.;[x] and again, *But I trust in the* LORD, *that I also myself shall come shortly;*[y] and in his Epistle to Philemon he says, *But withal prepare me also a lodging: for I trust that through your prayers I shall be given unto you.*[z]

Moreover, in Paul's Epistle to the Hebrews, he says,[a] *Know ye, that our brother Timothy is set at liberty; with whom, if he come shortly,* I WILL SEE YOU. *Salute all them that have the rule over you, and all the saints.* THEY OF ITALY SALUTE YOU. The last sentence of this passage shows that Paul wrote from Italy; and the first, that he was at liberty; *I will see you.*

To this it may be added that Clement, who was contemporary with the Apostles and is mentioned by Paul,[b] says of him that "he preached both in the East and in the West, leaving behind him the glorious report of his faith, and so having taught the whole world righteousness, and for that end travelled *even to the utmost bounds of the West;* he at last suffered martyrdom," &c.[c] It is certain that Paul's preaching was confined to the East and the eastern border of Europe before he was carried to Rome, (§80, 16) and therefore he must have been liberated in

t Coloss. iv. 14; Philemon 24.
u 2 Tim. iv. 10.
v Acts xxviii. 21.
w Acts xxviii. 30, 31.
x Philipp. i. 25.
y Philipp. ii. 24.
z Philemon 22.
a Heb. xxiii. 23, 24.
b Philipp. iv. 3.
c CLEMENT'S *Epistle to the Corinthians*, Sect. 5.

Digitized by Google

order to have preached in the extreme West. We know that he contemplated this just before he was arrested; as he tells the Romans in his epistle to them, that he is going to Jerusalem, to carry a contribution made for the Christians there by them of Macedonia and Achaia, (§16) and when he performed this he promised to visit them on his way to Spain.[d]

78. There was however another town called Miletum, in Crete. But the same or greater objections lie to the occurrence of this circumstance, before the arrest of Paul in Jerusalem, in any town of that island. Paul's time was so fully occupied for many years before his arrest in Jerusalem, that he could not have been in Crete during those years, and consequently, could not have left Trophimus there, as will appear immediately.

79. Paul planted a Church in that island, and gave Titus the charge of it; but this could not have occured before his confinement in Rome. There is no period of time from that in which Barnabas went from Antioch to Tarsus, to seek Saul or Paul,[e] until he was carried from Judea to Rome on his appeal to Cæsar, in which he could have been in Crete to establish a Church; every moment being occupied in places expressly stated in the Acts.

80. From Tarsus, in Cilicia, Paul went with Barnabas to Antioch in Syria, and spent there a whole year teaching the people.[f] *And in those days came prophets from Jerusalem unto Antioch;* and one of them having prophesied that there would be a great and general dearth, the disciples of Antioch determined to send relief to the brethren in Judea by the hands of Barnabas and Saul.[g] *And Barnabas and Saul returned from Jerusalem when they had fulfilled their ministry.*[h] After their return to Antioch as *they* (and others) *ministered to the* LORD *and fasted, the* HOLY GHOST *said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them.*[i]—*So they, being sent forth by the* HOLY GHOST, *departed unto Seleucia;* (a neighbouring sea-port;) *and from thence they sailed to Cyprus.*[k] They landed in this island at Salamis, and passed through its whole length to Paphos.[l]—From Paphos they sailed to Perga on the main land, in Pamphylia.[m] From Perga they travelled to Antioch in Pisidia;[n] from Antioch to Iconium, a town in Lycaonia,[o] and *there abode a long time;*[p] from Iconium they were obliged to fly, first to Lystra,[q] and then to Derbe,[r] neighbouring cities of Lycaonia; and from Derbe they returned to Lystra, Iconium, and Antioch;[s] and went to Perga and Attalia in Pamphylia;[t] and sailed thence to Antioch (in Syria) from whence they had set out;[u] and there they abode a long time.[v]

---

d Rom. xv. 25—28.
e Acts xi. 25.
f Acts xi. 26.
g Acts xi. 27, 30.
h Acts xii. 25.
i Acts xiii. 2.
k Acts xiii. 4.
l Acts xiii. 5, 6.
m Acts xiii. 13.
n Acts xiii. 14.
o Acts xiii. 51.
p Acts xiv. 3.
q Acts xiv. 6, 8.
r Acts xiv. 20.
s Acts xiv. 21.
t Acts xiv. 25.
u Acts xiv. 26.
v Acts xiv. 28

Digitized by Google

While they abode there, some difficulties having been raised about circumcision, Paul and Barnabas, and some others, were sent by the Church at Antioch to the Apostles and Elders in Jerusalem about this question;[w] and when it was settled they returned to Antioch.[x] There they remained for a short time,[y] and after *some days* Paul went with Silas through Syria and the neighbouring country, Cilicia, confirming the Churches.[z] From Cilicia he went into Lycaonia which adjoins it, and again visited the disciples in the cities of Derbe and Lystra.[a] From Lycaonia they travelled into the neighbouring countries or provinces of Phrygia and Galatia, and thence into Mysia, to Troas on the sea-coast.[b] From Troas, in consequence of a vision, Paul sailed to Samothrace, a neighbouring island, and the next day to Neapolis, and thence to Philippi, in Macedonia, which was not far off, and in that city they remained some time.[c] From Philippi they went to the neighbouring towns Amphipolis, Apollonia, and Thessalonica.[d] An uproar arising in the latter city, Paul went to the neighbouring city, Berea:[e] and being driven from Berea by the Jews of Thessalonica who followed him, he was conducted through the country to Athens.[f] There he waited for Silas and Timothy, whom he left behind in Berea,[g] but before they arrived he went to Corinth,[h] where Silas and Timothy re-joined him,[i] and there Paul continued near two years.[k]

From Corinth he sailed into Syria, and with him Priscilla and Aquila, and he came to Ephesus and left them there.[l] From Ephesus he went to Jerusalem, to keep the feast, and from thence he went down to Antioch. *And after he had spent some time there, he departed, and went over all the country of Galatia and Phrygia, in order, strengthening all the disciples;*[m] *Paul having passed through the upper coasts, came to Ephesus*, and there remained three years.[n]

His travels from this time until he was arrested in Jerusalem and carried to Rome are minutely stated in the 16th Section of this Essay; and it is evident from the most careful attention to the subject, that there is no period of this time in which he established a Church in Crete.

81. Titus, moreover, was with Paul in the commencement of this period, having gone up to Jerusalem from Antioch with Paul and Barnabas;[o] and he is mentioned as having been engaged in journeys for Paul, immediately before his voyage to Jerusalem and thence to Rome: that is, he is mentioned, in the second Epistle to the Corinthians, as having been engaged in

---

w Acts xv. 1—4.
x Acts xv. 22, 30.
y Acts xv. 35, 36.
z Acts xv. 36, 41.
a Acts xvi. 1.
b Acts xvi. 6, 7, 8.
c Acts xvi. 11, 12.
d Acts xvii. 1.
e Acts xvii. 10.
f Acts xvii. 15.
g Acts xvii. 16.
h Acts xviii. 1.
i Acts xviii. 5.
k Acts xviii, 11, 18.
l Acts xviii. 18, 19.
m Acts xviii. 21—23.
n Acts xix. 1, 8, 10; xx. 31.
o Galatians ii. 1, 3; Acts xi. 30.

Digitized by Google

travelling backwards and forwards from Macedonia to Corinth; and this Epistle was written from Ephesus a few months before Paul made the voyage to Jerusalem, as appears from the following considerations.

82. In the first Epistle to the Corinthians, Paul tells them that he has sent Timothy to visit them,[p] mentions his going to Jerusalem, tells them that he shall pass through Macedonia, and that he will visit them and probably winter with them, but that he shall *tarry at Ephesus until Pentecost.*[q]

In the second Epistle to the same, he refers, in the 15th and 16th verses of the first chapter, to his promised visit. The 23d verse shows this promise had not been fulfilled. The 12th and 13th verses of the second chapter show that Paul passed by Troas in travelling from Ephesus, and had gone into Macedonia, as he had written to them he should do.[r] The 5th and 6th verses of the seventh chapter, the 1st &c. of the eighth, and the second of the ninth, (*I boast* &c. in the present tense,) show that he was in Macedonia: and the 3d, 4th, and 5th verses of the ninth chapter show that he was about going to Corinth.

83. All these transactions correspond precisely with what is related in the Acts;[s] and we have there the additional account, that after spending the winter in Greece,[t] as he had promised, he sailed to Jerusalem in the spring, as he had also informed the Corinthians he had thoughts of doing.[u]

84. These considerations fix the time of writing the Epistles to the Corinthians, and consequently of the employment of Titus by Paul. When the latter arrived at Troas he expected to meet him.[v] His arrival is mentioned in the 6th verse of the seventh chapter, and his return to Corinth in the 16th and 17th verses of the eighth chapter.

85. From the whole account there is no ground to believe either that Paul planted a Church in Crete, or that he left Titus there, in the period mentioned: *viz.* from the time that Barnabas went to Tarsus to seek him, until his voyage to Jerusalem and Rome: and consequently these things must have been done after Paul's confinement in Rome.

86. Paul's Epistle to Titus was written after his settlement in Crete.[w] In it, it is said, *Bring Zenas the lawyer and Apollos on their journey diligently, that nothing be wanting to them.*[x] Apollos was instructed in the way of the LORD at Ephesus, by Aquila and Priscilla, a short time before Paul commenced his operations in that city;[y] and a little before the latter arrived there, Apollos went to Greece,[z] was still at Corinth when Paul arrived at Ephesus,[a] and remained there long enough to obtain great influence,[b] He was not therefore in Crete when Paul went

p 1 Cor. iv. 17.
q 1 Cor. iv. 19; xvi. 3—8.
r 1 Cor. xvi. 5.
s Acts xix. 21, 22; xx. 1, 2.
t Acts xx. 3.
u Acts xx. 6 &c. and xxi. 1—17.
v 2 Cor. ii. 12, 13.
w Tit. i. 5.
x Tit. iii. 13.
y Acts xviii. 26.
z Acts xviii. 27.
a Acts xix. 1.
b 1 Cor. i. 12; iii. 4.

Digitized by Google

to Ephesus, and it could not have been at that period that Paul wrote to Titus to bring Apollos on his journey from Crete.

87. In the 12th verse of the same chapter of the Epistle to Titus in which he is urged to bring Zenas and Apollos on their way, Paul says, *When I shall send Artemas unto thee, or Tychicus, be diligent to come unto me at Nicopolis; for I have determined there to winter.*

It is certain that Paul did not leave Ephesus for three years, (§80, 16) and that he did not in that time, or in any subsequent period included in the history of the Acts, winter in Nicopolis; and therefore this epistle must have been written after that period, and consequently Paul was at liberty after the confinement in Rome mentioned in the Acts.

88. It is, from all these considerations, evident that Paul was set at liberty after some years' imprisonment in Rome, when he was carried there from Jerusalem as related in the Acts, and was actively engaged in preaching the Gospel. (§ 64 to 87.)

89. From the tenor of the second Epistle to Timothy and from the strong expressions of Paul, it is evident that he was again in prison in Rome, and near his end, having been more than once before the tribunal. He says, *At my first answer, no man stood with me, but all men forsook me.*[c] And again, *I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand. I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith.*[d]

90. When this Epistle was written, Timothy was still at Ephesus in charge of the Church, as is evident from what has been already stated, (§ 58) as well as from the following passages of the Epistle. *Hold fast the form of sound words, which thou hast heard of me, in faith and love which is in* CHRIST JESUS. *—And the things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also.—I charge thee, therefore, before* GOD, *and the* LORD JESUS CHRIST, *who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom; preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all long suffering and doctrine.*[e]

91. Timothy therefore governed the Church at Ephesus for an unknown length of time, in addition to the five and a half years which elapsed before Paul was discharged from his first imprisonment: and it is evident that the charge given him by Paul, in the beginning, was for an indefinite length of time: *I give thee charge in the sight of* GOD, *who quickeneth all things, and before* CHRIST JESUS, *who before Pontius Pilate witnessed a good confession, that thou keep this commandment without spot, unrebukeable,* UNTIL THE APPEARING OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST.

---

c 2 Tim. iv. 16. d 2 Tim. iv. 6, 7.

e 2 Tim. i. 13; ii. 2; iv. 1, 2. Compare these passages with 1. Tim. v. 21, and vi. 13, 20.

Digitized by Google

This passage shows that the charge was for an unlimited time, during which Timothy exercised the episcopal powers of governing the clergy as well as the laity, and of ordaining; (§ 11, 12, 13) and in conformity with this he was called Bishop of Ephesus by the ancient fathers, who also say that those who after the death of the Apostles were called Bishops, were in their life time called Apostles. (§56.)

92. Dr. Miller objects to the episcopal character of Timothy, that Presbyters participated in his ordination; a thing never admitted in the ordination of a Bishop.[f] There is however no evidence that Presbyters imposed hands on him when he was ordained Bishop. The passage in which *the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery* is mentioned, is in the first Epistle to Timothy.[g] This Epistle was written by Paul immediately after Timothy had consented to take charge of the Church at Ephesus. They were then about to sail from Greece to Asia, and Paul was suddenly compelled to leave the company and go through Macedonia, intending to rejoin them at Troas in Asia, where they landed; which he afterwards did. (§ 18 to 21.) While in Macedonia, having in contemplation the important office that Timothy was about to assume, he wrote this Epistle to him, (§21;) in which we find the following strong and appropriate language: *Till I come, give attendance to reading, to exhortation,* (or prayer) *to doctrine;* (or learning; *erudition.*) *Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery. Meditate upon these things; give thyself wholly to them, that thy profiting* MAY BE MANIFEST IN ALL.[h]

93. In this passage Timothy is spoken of as having *then* possession of the gift; *the gift that was given thee.* But this was before he took charge of the Church at Ephesus, and refers to an event which *had then passed.* Now, Timothy had been many years preaching before that time. He is mentioned as having preached at Philippi and Thessalonica, when Paul and he were there together, immediately after he went forth.[i] He is also mentioned as a minister of GOD, in Paul's first Epistle to the Corinthians,[k] which was written before Paul left Ephesus. Timothy therefore was ordained a Presbyter long before the first Epistle was written to him: and this ordination Paul refers to in the passage in question.[l]

94. It is proposed in the next place to show that Timothy had *successors* with the same powers we find him possessing in the Church of Ephesus.

95. It may be observed that Paul evidently contemplated his

---

f MILLER'S *Letters*, p. 54, [p. 32, 2d *ed.*]

g 1 Tim. iv. 14.

h The English translation stands thus; "that thy profiting *may appear to all.*" The words in the original, however, corresponding to those in ITALIC LETTERS above, are as follow: *φανερά ἦ ἐν πᾶσιν*; which cannot be correctly translated otherwise than as in Section 92, viz. *may be manifest in all.*

i 1 Thessalonians, i. ii.

k 1 Cor. iv. 17; xvi. 10.

l 1 Tim. iv. 14.

Digitized by Google

having successors, because he not only says to him, *Hold fast the form of sound words, which thou hast heard of me, in faith and love which is in* CHRIST JESUS; but also says, *And the things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also.*[m]

96. Let it be remembered that the evidence to be brought forward relates to *the practice of the Church*; to the matter of fact question, whether there were in the Apostolic times *one* or *three orders of ministers*; and that the witnesses are those venerable men who succeeded the Apostles in the charge of the Church, some of them having been the disciples of the Apostles; men who valued the order of the Church and its doctrines more than life, who freely delivered themselves up to cruel deaths in defence and maintenance of the truth; men who have been emphatically called *martyrs*, that is *witnesses* of the truth of the Gospel; the Greek word μαρτυρ signifying a WITNESS.

97. It is alleged, however, that by calling in the testimony of these ancient fathers, Episcopalians admit that their system is not *directly* laid down in the word of GOD; but assert that *the facts* stated in Scripture *taken in connexion* with the writers of the *early fathers*, decidedly support their claim.[n]

98. The Episcopalians assert, that the Scriptures show that the Apostles were over the Presbyters and Deacons, and appointed, ordained, and ruled them: (§12, 13,) and therefore that there were in the apostolical Church three orders of ministers—the Apostles, the Presbyters, and the Deacons.

99. Having shown this, they appeal to those contemporaries of the Apostles to whom the government of the Church was committed by them, and to their successors, for their testimony as to the question of fact, whether there were in the Church *one* or *three* orders of ministers in their time. They also appeal to them for the reason why the title of *Apostle* ceased in the Church, and to explain the difficulty that has been made by those who wish to confound the offices of Bishop and Presbyter, by showing *when* and *why* the first order assumed the title of *Bishop* in place of that of *Apostle*.

100. This is the only possible mode of deciding these points. In the very nature of things there can be no other. If men who depart from the established order of the Church, endeavour to justify themselves by alleging that the practice of the Church was originally as they wish to have it, to whom can they go for evidence respecting that practice, if not to such as lived in those days? some of whom had even been conversant with the Apostles. Did not these men know what was the order of the Church? Are not they, men who gave up their lives for the truth, to be trusted to say what it was?

101. These witnesses say, that when the Church was every

m 2 Tim. i. 13; ii. 2.

n MILLER'S *Letters*, p. 119. [p. 77, 2d *ed.*]

Digitized by Google

where established, the name of APOSTLE was left to those who were truly Apostles, (or *messengers*, αποςολοι,) and the name of BISHOP *was restrained* (or *confined*) *to those who were anciently called Apostles.* Thus Titus and Timothy are called by some *Apostles*, and by others *Bishops;* more commonly Bishops, because most of the writers who mentioned them, lived after this change of title was made. (§45, 46, 47, 56.)

It may also be remarked, that in the Acts, chap. i. 20, 25, both in the original and in the English translation, the words *Bishopric* and *Apostleship*, επισκοπη and αποςολη, are used as synonymous terms.

102. This evidence does not, however, satisfy men who are loath to yield; and they demand *express warrant* "that Bishops are an order of clergy superior to Presbyters; that their superiority rests on the appointment of CHRIST: and that with this superior order alone, are deposited all the treasures of ministerial order and succession."[o]

103. To this demand it is answered, that we have *express warrant* for saying, *that there was an order of clergy superior to Presbyters; that their superiority rests on the appointment of* CHRIST, *and that with this superior order alone, were deposited all the treasures of ministerial order and succession.*[p] Moreover that we have the positive testimony of those to whom *this superior order* committed the Church, *as their successors*, that they, when the Church was settled, dropped the name of APOSTLES, *messengers*, and, now that they were confined *to the oversight* of the Church in one city and the district of country surrounding it, assumed to themselves the more appropriate name of OVERSEERS or *Bishops*, and continued to exercise the powers of the superior order, viz. the apostolic order. (§56.)

104. After having answered the demand, it certainly is not improper to remark upon the modesty of those, who, being by their own acknowledgment innovators upon the settled order of government for thirteen or fourteen hundred years, and setting up a claim *to be the first and sole order of ministers* instead of the second, instead of showing *express warrant* for their innovation, turn about upon those from whom they derived their ordination to the second order, and demand of them *express warrant* for continuing in the authority which they had had from the beginning, derived from the Apostles who constituted them their successors. (§44 to 56.)

105. What reply have they to make to the demand of *express warrant* for a Presbyter's assumption of the whole ministerial power? for Presbyters being the only order of ministers—the successors of the Apostles? or for instituting the two lay-orders of Ruling Elders and Deacons? What is their *express warrant*,

---

o MILLER'S *Letters*, p. 71. [p. 45, 2d *ed.*]
p See Sect. 12, 13, 39—41; and Acts xiv. 23; Titus i. 5.

Digitized by Google

for instance, for a Presbyter's power to ordain? They do not pretend to bring any; but in support of the claim to the power of ordaining, offer a defective argument, as has been shown, and three cases in which it is pretended that Presbyters ordained; in one of which *the ordainers* are not shown to have been Presbyters, and *the ordained* were both Apostles, one of them for seventeen years before; in another, the ordained is said to have received the gift *by* the laying on of the hands of Paul and *with* those of the Presbyters; and in the third the pretended ordaining Presbyter is expressly called an Apostle in the Acts. [p. 204 to 211.]

106. Let us carry this a little further. What reply do they make to the demand for *express warrant* for baptizing infants? for baptizing by pouring, or sprinkling with water? for the change of the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week? They have none to give: and having, on the question of church government, denied that *facts which are mentioned in the sacred history, taken in connexion with the writings of the early fathers*, are sufficient authority; having demanded *a warrant which would be indubitable and satisfactory, if all books, excepting the Bible, were banished from the Church*,[q] they are without any authority but what they can infer from the facts of Scripture: and to this Dr. Miller is driven. When asked for his *express warrant* for Infant Baptism, he says, "We can prove from Scripture, with absolute certainty, the divine right of INFANT CHURCH MEMBERSHIP; and we can prove, from the same source, and with equal certainty, the divine right of BAPTISM TO ALL CHURCH MEMBERS. This is *warrant as express* as could be desired."[r]

No man in his senses, however, can be induced to believe, that there is an *express warrant* for that which requires for its establishment a long argument in two parts: 1st. To prove the right of infants to church membership, and, 2ndly, To prove that all members of the Church have a right to baptism. The presbyterian writers have, accordingly, not thought proper to rest the doctrine of the baptism of infants on this argument, but have, with one consent, proved it to have been the practice of the Church by the testimony of these very fathers, whose evidence they have endeavoured to discredit on the subject of church government.

107. Thus DWIGHT quotes in support of this practice, "Justin Martyr, born near the close of the first century;" "Irenæus, born about the year 97, a disciple of Polycarp, who was a disciple of John;" "Clemens Alexandrinus, born about the middle of the second century;" "Tertullian, born about the same time with Irenæus;" "Origen, born about the year 184, and a man of more information than any man of his time;" "Cyprian, who

---

q MILLER'S *Letters*, p. 119, 72. [p. 77, 46, 2d *ed.*]
r MILLER'S *Letters*, p. 121. [p. 78, 2d *ed.*]

Digitized by Google

was contemporary with Origen;" "Gregory Nazianzen, born in the early part of the fourth century;" "St. Augustin, born in the middle of the fourth century;" and "Pelagius, a contemporary with Augustin."[s]

It follows beyond the possibility of question with disinterested men, that they would not have objected to the testimony of the fathers on this subject, had it not been in their way.

108. The father who has expressed himself as positively and as clearly as any other whose writings have been preserved, is Ignatius. Accordingly, the greatest efforts have been made to set aside his testimony.

109. There are two editions of his Epistles, called the larger and the smaller. Dr. Lardner, who was an English dissenter, and therefore a Presbyterian in doctrine, and whose work on *The Credibility of the Gospel History* is a standard production, says in that work,[t] "I have carefully compared the two editions, and am very well satisfied, upon that comparison, that the larger are an interpolation of the smaller, and not the smaller an epitome or abridgement of the larger. I desire no better evidence in a thing of this nature." He says again,[u] "As the interpolations of the larger Epistles are plainly the work of some Arian, so even the smaller Epistles may have been tampered with by the Arians, or the Orthodox, or both; though I do not affirm, there are in them any considerable corruptions or alterations."

110. These two passages, compared, show that the additions made to the smaller edition of these Epistles, consist of interpolations made to favour the doctrines of Arius, in the controversy between him and the orthodox, and possibly of some made by the orthodox themselves. They are, therefore, such as relate to that controversy, which had nothing to do with the subject of church government, or episcopacy, but related to the nature of our LORD JESUS CHRIST; *viz.* whether he was a divine person, or only the most exalted of created beings. It is evident, therefore, that there is not the slightest ground to suspect the interpolation of passages to favour episcopacy. Indeed the passages respecting the three orders of ministers are so numerous in these Epistles, are so completely interwoven with their whole substance, and arise so naturally out of the subject of the Epistles; *viz.* advice to the Christians of the different Churches addressed, respecting their conduct to one another and to those who had the rule over them; that it is impossible to separate these passages from the rest without utterly destroying the whole structure and tenor of the Epistles.

111. The only question, then, to be considered is, whether or not these are the genuine Epistles of Ignatius. Let Dr. Lardner be heard on this subject. He writes as follows:[v]

---

s DWIGHT'S *Theology*, Vol. V. p. 318, 319.
t Vol. II. p. 68. u Page 69. v Vol. II. p. 66.

Digitized by Google

"Having given this general account of the age of Ignatius, I shall next transcribe the most ancient testimonies concerning him and his Epistles. And then I shall make a few remarks.

"We have this passage in Irenæus: 'As one of our people, for his testimony of God condemned to wild beasts, said: I am the wheat of God, and ground by the teeth of wild beasts, that I may be found to be pure bread." Which words are in §. 4 of Ignatius' Epistle to the Romans. And this passage is also cited from Irenæus by Eusebius; who in another place likewise says: 'Irenæus mentions Justin Martyr, and Ignatius, making use of testimonies out of their writings.'

"We meet with Ignatius twice mentioned by Origen. 'Finally,' says he, 'I remember, that one of the saints, Ignatius by name, has said of Christ: My love is crucified.' Which words are in the same Epistle to the Romans, §. vii. Again: 'I have observed it elegantly written in an epistle of a martyr, I mean Ignatius, second Bishop of Antioch after Peter, that the virginity of Mary was unknown to the prince of this world.' See the Epistle to Ephesians, §. xix.

"Eusebius, beside what has been already taken from him, says in another place, after the mention of Polycarp and Papias, as contemporaries: 'At the same time also flourished Ignatius, who is still highly honoured, being the second in the succession of the Church of Antioch after Peter. It is said, that he was sent from Syria to Rome to be devoured by wild beasts, for the testimony of Christ. And making his journey through Asia under a strong guard, he confirmed the Churches in every city by his discourses, and especially cautioned them against the heresies then springing up, and gaining ground; and exhorted them to adhere to the tradition of the Apostles. And for the greater security, he also put down his instructions in writing. Therefore when he came to Smyrna, where Polycarp was, he wrote an epistle to the Church at Ephesus, another to the Church in Magnesia upon the [river] Meander——and another to the Church at Trallium——and beside these, he wrote also to the Church at Rome; [from which Eusebius quotes a long passage.] These things he wrote from the forementioned city to those Churches. Afterwards removing from Smyrna he wrote to the Philadelphians from Troas, and to the Church of Smyrna, and in particular to their president Polycarp.' Eusebius proceeds then not only to refer to a passage of this Epistle to Polycarp, but quotes also distinctly a passage from the Epistle to the Church of Smyrna; and then puts down a passage of the Epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians, in the latter part of which he says to them: 'The Epistles of Ignatius sent by him to us, together with what other have come to our hands, we have sent to you, which are subjoined to this Epistle: by which you may be greatly profited. For they treat of faith and patience, and of all things pertaining to edification in our Lord.' And thus we have seen also Polycarp's testimony in general to these Epistles, who collected them.

"To the same purpose St. Jerom in his book *of Illustrious Men:* 'Ignatius, the third Bishop of the Church of Antioch after the Apostle Peter, in the persecution under Trajan was condemned to wild beasts. And when he came to Smyrna, where Polycarp, the disciple of John, was Bishop, he wrote an Epistle to the Ephesians, another to the Magnesians, a third to the Trallians, a fourth to the Romans: and when he was gone thence, he wrote to the Philadelphians, the Smyrneans, and in particular to Polycarp.'

"I shall transcribe no more testimonies of the ancients, but refer the reader for the rest to the *Patres Apostolici* of Le Clerc."

112. What inducement, then, can there be for rejecting these Epistles, seeing that they are most unexceptionable, and are

Digitized by Google

written in the very spirit of an ardently pious Christian? Let another Presbyterian answer this question; one of whom Dr. Miller speaks in the following terms: "The celebrated Grotius, whose great learning and talents will be considered by all as giving much weight to his opinion on any subject, is full and decided in maintaining that the primitive Church was formed after the model of the Synagogue."[w] In a note to this passage Dr. Miller says, "Though Grotius was bred a Presbyterian; yet being soured by what he considered ill treatment from the Church of Holland, he discovered a strong predilection for episcopacy. When this is considered, the declarations above cited carry with them peculiar force."

113. The celebrated Grotius, then, when writing to Vossius concerning Blondel's opinion of these Epistles, says, "the Epistles of Ignatius, which your son brought out of Italy, pure from all those things which the learned have hitherto suspected (*in the larger epistles*, §109) Blondel will not admit, because they afford a clear testimony to the antiquity of episcopacy."[x] Blondel, Grotius, and Vossius were all most learned presbyterian writers.

The following passage, showing the same disposition with regard to these Epistles, is from Mosheim, a most learned Lutheran clergyman, and no friend to episcopacy. "Perhaps there would have been no contention with most persons about the Epistles of Ignatius, if those who contend for the divine origin and antiquity of episcopal government had not been enabled to support their cause with them."[y]

114. Let us now proceed with the subject. It was proposed to show that Timothy had successors with the same powers which he exercised in the Church at Ephesus. (§92)

115. In the Epistle of Ignatius to the Ephesians—the very Church over which Timothy had presided—written about forty years after the death of Paul, there is complete evidence of this. He writes to the Ephesians in the following manner: "I received therefore, in the name of God, your whole multitude in *Onesimus*; who by inexpressible love is ours, but according to the flesh is your Bishop, whom I beseech you by Jesus Christ, to love; and that you would all strive to be like unto him. And blessed be God, who has granted unto you, who are so worthy of him, to enjoy such an excellent Bishop.[z]

116. From this quotation, it is evident that, as Ignatius mentioned *Onesimus* with great marks of respect, as the Bishop of the Ephesians, he must have exercised all the powers that that father represents as belonging to the episcopal office. What these powers were, can be seen in the passages in italics in the

---

w Miller's *Reply to Dr. Bowden*, p. 105. [p. 284, 2d *ed.*]

x Bowden's *Letters*, Vol. I. p. 176, [Vol. I. p. 85, 2d *ed.*] quoted from Pearson's *Vindiciæ*, Chap. v.

y *De Rebus Christianorum ante Constant.* p. 160. See *Religious World Displayed*, Vol. II. p. 281, note.

z Sect. 1, Appendix.

Digitized by Google

Appendix. They include those of ordaining, and of ruling the clergy, as well as the laity.

117. "Eusebius in his Ecclesiastical History says, 'That Evodius having been the first Bishop of Antioch, Ignatius succeeded him.' With whom St. Jerome agrees. In his Chronicle, Eusebius places the ordination of Ignatius in the year 69, after the death of Peter and Paul at Rome. Nevertheless some think that Ignatius was ordained by Peter; and suppose that Evodius and Ignatius were both Bishops of Antioch at one and the same time; the one of the Jewish and the other of the Gentile Christians: but that after the death of Evodius they all came to be under Ignatius as their Bishop."[a]

118. Ignatius, therefore, having been ordained in the year 69, which was about the year of Paul's death, was contemporary with both Timothy and Onesimus, and, if there was any between them, with him also. He must also have been well acquainted with the order of the Church before his ordination, and consequently the powers he ascribes to the Bishop, were exercised by Timothy and others in the life time of the Apostles, and until the death of Ignatius.

119. This is in the strongest manner confirmed, if confirmation it need to any man's conscience, by the address of Ignatius in his Epistle to the Trallians; in which he speaks of *that Church continuing in the Apostolical character*. See the words in italics in the address to the Epistle to the Trallians, in the Appendix: and in this Epistle, it is to be remarked, some of the strongest passages are to be found respecting the existence of three orders of ministers, and the supremacy of the Bishop. See the passages in italics in Sections 2, 3, 7, 12, 13, of the Epistle to the Trallians.

120. Ignatius likewise in the Address to the Philadelphians, salutes them "*especially if they are at unity with the Bishop and Presbyters who are with him, and the Deacons appointed according to the mind of* JESUS CHRIST; *whom he has settled according to his own will in all firmness by his* HOLY SPIRIT." This Epistle also contains strong passages showing the existence of three orders, the supremacy of the Bishop, and the ministerial character of the Deacons. See passages in italics, in Sections 3, 4, 7, 10, 11, of the Epistle to the Philadelphians.

121. See also the remarkable address to the Smyrneans, and the 8th and 9th Sections of the Epistle, for striking evidence of the same.

122. See also the address to Polycarp, Bishop of the Church at Smyrna, and the 4th and 6th Sections of the Epistle.

123. These quotations show most unquestionably that Ignatius, who was acquainted with some of the Apostles, and was the disciple of John, considered these Churches, in which it is so repeatedly stated that the Bishop is the source of all ministerial authority, and to be reverenced by all, and *especially by the Presbyters*, AS CONTINUING IN THE APOSTOLICAL CHARACTER,

---

a LARDNER'S *Credibility of the Gospel History*, Vol. II. p. 65.

Digitized by Google

124. We also see in Polycarp's Epistle to the Philippians, evidence of the same kind. He was the fellow disciple and intimate friend of Ignatius, with whom he spent some short time at Smyrna while on his journey to Rome to be devoured by lions.

With regard to the authenticity of the Epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians, we have the most satisfactory evidence from Irenæus. Irenæus is thus spoken of by Mosheim. He says of his *five Books against heresies*, they "are considered as one of the most precious monuments of ancient erudition."[b] Lardner also speaks of him with great respect throughout his account of him.

125. "Irenæus says in his excellent work against all heresies: 'And Polycarp teaches the same things, who was not only taught by the Apostles, and had conversed with many who had seen CHRIST, but was also by the Apostles appointed Bishop of the Church of Smyrna in Asia. Whom also I saw in my early age (for he lived long, and at a great age had a glorious and splendid martyrdom.) I say Polycarp always taught these things, which he had learned from the Apostles, which he delivered to the Church, and which alone are true. To this bear witness all the Churches in Asia, and they who to this time have succeeded Polycarp,' &c. 'There is also a most excellent Epistle of Polycarp written to the Philippians; from which they who are willing, and are concerned for their own salvation, may learn both the character of his faith, and the doctrine of the truth."[c]

126. In this Epistle, Polycarp speaks of *the blessed Ignatius; of Ignatius, Paul, &c. not having run in vain; and of their having gone to the place that was due to them from the* LORD. He tells the Philippians, "The Epistles of Ignatius which he wrote unto us, together with what others of his have come to our hands, we have sent to you according to your order; which are subjoined to this Epistle; by which you may be greatly profited; for they treat of faith and patience, and of all things that pertain to edification in the LORD JESUS."[d]

127. This strong expression of approbation and exalted esteem, this ranking Ignatius with Paul, this claim of an inheritance in the kingdom of heaven for him, and this great regard aud value set on the letters he left behind, show that Polycarp completely agreed with Ignatius in relation to the great concerns of the Church. All that we see, therefore, in the passages in italics in the Epistles of Ignatius, stands supported by the evidence of Polycarp, as completely as if he had himself written those Epistles.

Polycarp suffered martyrdom in the year 148, according to Bishop Pearson, who makes it earlier than any other writer: many learned men place it in 167, or thereabouts.[e]

128. Irenæus was the disciple of Polycarp, according to Euse-

---

b MOSHEIM'S *Ecclesiastical History*, Century II. Part II. Chap. II Sect. v.
c LARDNER'S *Credibility*, &c. Vol. II. p. 86, 87.
d POLYCARP'S *Epistle to the Philippians*, Sect. 9.
e LARDNER, Vol. II. p. 88.

Digitized by Google

bius and Jerome. "Tertullian mentions him as one of the most considerable writers of the Christian Church." "Eusebius says, 'when Pothinus had been put to death with the martyrs in Gaul, Irenæus succeeded him in the bishopric of the Church of Lyons; who, in his youth, had been a disciple of Polycarp.'"[f]

After making other extracts from Eusebius respecting Irenæus, Dr. Lardner says, "It is perhaps needless to put down after these, St. Jerome's testimony: I shall, however, take a part of his account of this excellent person, which we have in his book *of Illustrious Men.*

"Irenæus, Presbyter of Pothinus, who was Bishop of the Church of Lyons in Gaul, carried a letter from the martyrs of that city concerning some disputes of the Church to Eleutherus, Bishop of Rome, in which letter he is honourably mentioned. Afterwards, Pothinus having obtained the crown of martyrdom, when he was almost ninety years of age, he was substituted in his room. It is certain he was a disciple of Polycarp, Bishop and martyr. He wrote five books against heresies."[g]

Mosheim says of him, "Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons, a Greek by birth, and probably born of Christian parents, a disciple also of Polycarp, by whom he was sent to preach the gospel among the Gauls, is another of the writers of this century, (the second) whose labours were singularly useful to the Church. He turned his pen against its internal and domestic enemies, by attacking the monstrous errors which were adopted by many of the primitive Christians, as appears by his *five Books against Heresies*, which are yet preserved in a Latin translation, and are considered *as one of the most precious monuments of ancient erudition.*" (§124.)

129. The reader will bear in mind that Tertullian, Eusebius, and Jerome, are names of highest reputation in ancient times; and Lardner and Mosheim in modern days; and that the two latter were not Episcopalians, the former of the two being a dissenter from the English Church and the latter a Lutheran. Many other testimonies might be added from writers in different ages of the Church. Let us now inquire what Irenæus has written on the subject of episcopacy. The following is a translation of the third chapter of the third of those books against heresies, said by Mosheim to be "*one of the most precious monuments of ancient erudition.*"

130. "It is, therefore, with all in the Church, who wish to hear the truth, to understand fully the tradition of the Apostles published through the whole world; and we can enumerate *those who were appointed by the Apostles Bishops in the Churches, and their successors even to us*, who have taught no such thing; neither have they known what is idly talked of by these (*viz.* the heretics.) For if the Apostles had known hidden mysteries, which they taught apart and secretly to the perfect, they would have deliv-

f LARDNER'S *Credibility*, &c. Vol. II. p. 154.
g LARDNER, Vol. II. p. 156.

Digitized by Google

ered them to those especially to whom they committed even the Churches themselves. For they wished those to be very perfect and irreprehensible in all things, *whom they left their successors, delivering* (to them) *their own place of government*, who acting correctly, great benefit would arise; but the greatest calamity, if they should fall away. But seeing that it is very long, in such a volume as this, to enumerate *the successions of all the Churches*, by pointing out the tradition of the greatest, the most ancient, and universally known Church, founded and constituted at Rome by the two most glorious Apostles, Peter and Paul, which (tradition) it has from the Apostles, and the faith announced to mankind, coming even to us by the successions of Bishops, we confound all those who, in whatever manner, either through their evil inclination, or through vain glory, or through blindness and wicked designs, conclude more than is fit.—*For, with this Church, on account of its greater pre-eminence, it is necessary that every Church should agree*; that is, *those which are in all respects faithful*; in which is always preserved, by those who are round about, that tradition which is from the Apostles. *The blessed Apostles, therefore, founding and instructing the Church, delivered to Linus the Bishopric* TO GOVERN THE CHURCH. Paul makes mention of this Linus in the Epistles which are to Timothy. To him succeeded Anacletus; after him in the third place from the Apostles, *Clement obtained the Bishopric*; who both saw the Apostles themselves, and conferred with them, when as yet he had the preaching of the Apostles sounding in his ears, and their tradition before his eyes. Not indeed alone; many as yet remained, at that time, taught by the Apostles.

"*Under this Clement*, no slight dissension having arisen among the brethren who were at Corinth, the Church which was at Rome wrote the most powerful letters to the Corinthians, exhorting them to peace, and refreshing their faith, and declaring the tradition which they had recently received from the Apostles, announcing one GOD Omnipotent, the Maker of heaven and earth, the Creator of man, who caused the flood, and called Abraham, who led his people out of the land of Egypt, who spoke to Moses, who appointed the law, and sent the prophets, who will prepare a fire for the devil and his angels. They who desire may learn from the Scripture that He is declared to be the Father of our LORD JESUS CHRIST, and may understand the apostolical tradition of the Church, although those who now teach falsely, and pretend there is another GOD above the Creator and Maker of all these things which exist, should have a more ancient epistle. *To this Clement, however, succeeded Evaristus; and to Evaristus, Alexander; and then Sixtus was appointed, the sixth from the Apostles; and after him Telesphorus, who likewise suffered martyrdom most gloriously: and then Hyginus, then Pius, after whom Anicetus. And when also Soter had succeeded Anicetus, now Eleutherus has the Bishopric in the twelfth place from the Apostles.* BY THIS ORDINATION AND SUCCESSION, that tradition in the Church which is from the Apostles, and the doctrine of the truth, hath come even unto us. And this is a most full showing that there is one and the same lively faith, which has been preserved in the Church from the Apostles until now and handed down in truth.

"And POLYCARP ALSO; *who was not only taught by the Apostles and conversed with many of those who had seen our* LORD, *but was likewise appointed by the Apostles Bishop in that Church which is at Smyrna in Asia*, whom we also have seen in our younger days: for he continued a long time, and departed this life when very old, most gloriously and most nobly suffering martyrdom: (literally *bearing witness*, FACIENS MARTYRIUM;) He always taught those things which he had learned from the Apostles, which he likewise delivered to the Church, and which are alone true. And

Digitized by Google

all the Churches which are in Asia bear testimony to these things, and those who succeeded Polycarp until this time: which man is a witness of much greater authority; and a more faithful witness of the truth; than Valentine and Marcion, and the rest who are of a perverse opinion. For it is he who, when he came to the city *under Anicetus*, converted many heretics, of those whom we have before mentioned, to the Church of God, declaring that he had received this one and sole truth from the Apostles, which likewise he delivered to the Church. And there are those who heard him saying, that John the disciple of the Lord, going to bathe in Ephesus, when he saw Cerinthus within, went hastily out of the bathing house without washing, saying that he feared lest the house should fall while Cerinthus, the enemy of truth, was in it. And Polycarp himself, Marcion meeting him once and saying, Do you know me? answered, I know you the first-born of Satan. So much did the Apostles and their disciples fear, lest they should even by a word communicate with any one of those who adulterated the truth; as Paul likewise says, A man that is heretical after one reproof, avoid; knowing that he who is so, is perverse and condemned by himself. And there is also a most excellent Epistle of Polycarp written to the Philippians, from which they who wish and have regard for their own salvation, can learn the character of his faith and the doctrine of the truth.

"And the Church which is at Ephesus, founded indeed by Paul, but John remaining with them even to the time of Trajan, is likewise a true witness of the doctrine of the Apostles."

(It is proper to remark that I had not seen Irenæus' works until after the 55th Section of this Essay had been printed off.)

131. This passage from Irenæus is most explicit in every particular. It is expressly stated:

1. That the Apostles appointed Bishops in all the Churches, and left them as their successors TO GOVERN THE CHURCH.

2. That the episcopate or bishopric was delivered to one person, and one Bishop only *at a time* is ever mentioned as governing the Church: thus the Apostles delivered the episcopate to Linus *to govern the Church* at Rome; Anacletus *succeeded* him, and *after him*, in the third place Clement obtained the episcopate; and the names of twelve *successive* Bishops are given, who governed that Church, each in his day; as indicated by the expressions, *under Clement*, *under Anicetus*. (See §130.)

3. It is expressly stated that there were successions of Bishops *in all the Churches;* and that with the Church at Rome, in which the names of twelve successive Bishops are given, every Church should agree, that is, *those which were in all respects faithful.*

4. That Polycarp was taught by the Apostles, and was *by them appointed Bishop of Smyrna.*

132. This doctrine is repeated in other chapters. In the 63rd Chapter of the 4th Book, Irenæus says, "True knowledge is the doctrine of the Apostles, &c., *according to the successions of the Bishops, to whom they* (viz. *the Apostles*) *delivered that Church which is in every place*," &c.

133. In the 20th Chapter of the 5th Book, speaking of those who derive their authority from the Apostles, in comparison with heretics, he says, "For they are all far behind *the Bishops*

Digitized by Google

to whom the Apostles delivered the Churches, and this we have with all carefulness made apparent in the third book:" in which it is shown that the Apostles delivered the government of the Church in each place to one Bishop at a time; (§130) and that in immensely populous cities, where there were numerous Presbyters; as in Rome, the population of which is estimated to have been, about that time, above a million.

134. Testimony more conclusive cannot, perhaps, be produced upon any subject *not a matter of controversy when the writer lived.* Had the doctrine ever been advanced, that the Apostles had committed the episcopate to the whole body of the Presbyters in Rome, for the government of the Church, a more explicit declaration to the contrary could not have been necessary.

135. Strong, however, as is the testimony, Dr. Miller has made an effort to show that Irenæus is 'an important and decisive witness on the subject before us.' Important and decisive he truly is; but not on the side of the question Dr. Miller would have his readers believe. To make good his assertion, he quotes several passages.

136. In page 150 of Dr. Miller's Letters,[h] he has given, as a quotation from the commencement of the 3rd Chapter of the 3rd Book of Irenæus, the following words. "The Apostolic tradition is present in every Church. We can enumerate those who were constituted *Bishops* by the Apostles in the Churches, and *their successors even to us*, who taught no such thing. By showing the tradition and declared faith of the greatest and most ancient Church of Rome, which she received from the Apostles, and which is come to us *through the succession of the Bishops*, we confound all who conclude otherwise than they ought."

137. By comparing this with the translation given in a preceding section, (§130) it may be observed, that, independently of other liberties taken with the passage, several sentences are entirely left out, *viz.* commencing at the words, "For if the Apostles," and ending with the words, "*enumerate the succession of all the Churches.*" In this omitted part is contained the very substance of the controversy, *viz.* that the Apostles left the Bishops *their successors, delivering* (to them) *their own place of government.*"

138. In the next page, Dr. Miller gives, as a quotation from the same book of Irenæus, the words stated in the 55th Section of this Essay. By comparing the quotation from Dr. Miller in the 136th Section, in connexion with that in the 55th Section, *with the translation in the* 130*th Section*, it will be found that the two passages are intimately connected.

139. Dr. Miller has, however, not only *omitted* the connecting sentences between these two passages, but he has *interposed* between them several quotations from the 4th and 5th Books of Irenæus. The effect is to break the thread of the argument.

---

h [Page 98, 2d *ed.*]

Digitized by Google

140. Irenæus asserts that *he could enumerate those who were appointed by the Apostles Bishops in the Churches, and their successors to his time, whom the Apostles left* AS THEIR SUCCESSORS, DELIVERING TO THEM THEIR OWN PLACE OF GOVERNORS. But seeing that it would be too long to enumerate the successions of ALL THE CHURCHES, he confines himself to pointing out the tradition in the Church at Rome. Then follows *the reason* for this, which Dr. Miller has omitted: *For with this Church, on account of its greater pre-eminence, it is necessary that every Church should agree; that is, those which are in all respects faithful*," &c. Irenæus *then* goes on to say, "The blessed Apostles, therefore, founding and instructing the Church, (*viz.* at Rome) delivered to Linus the bishopric, *to govern the Church*," &c.[i]

141. So much for the connexion between these two passages. It is necessary to make a remark or two upon the passage itself, (contained in the 55th Section.)

On comparing the translation above (§130) with Dr. Miller's, (§55) it will be observed that in his quotation the words "TO GOVERN THE CHURCH," are not to be found, in the passage stating that the episcopate or bishopric was delivered by the Apostles to Linus.

After the statement that Anacletus and Clement succeeded Linus, several sentences are omitted, not however very material as relates to the question before us, and the quotation is resumed at the commencement of the italic lines in Section 130: "To this Clement," &c. In Dr. Miller's translation the word ORDINATION is left out. The passage in Irenæus runs thus, *By this* ORDINATION AND *succession*, &c.—Dr. Miller has it, *By this succession* that tradition, &c. is come to us.[k]

That the reader may have an opportunity of judging for himself of this matter, the whole 3rd Chapter of the 3rd Book of Irenæus will be annexed to these pages, in the Latin.

142. Dr. Miller also quotes several other passages from Irenæus, in which the word *Presbyter* occurs, and he endeavours to show thereby that *Bishop* and *Presbyter* are one, immediately in the face of the fact that there were always numerous Presbyters in Rome, and never more than one Bishop.

143. He quotes these words: "We ought therefore to adhere to *those Presbyters who keep the Apostle's doctrine*, and together with *the presbyterial succession* do show forth sound speech. Such Presbyters the Church nourishes; and of such the Prophet says—I will give them *Princes* in peace, and *Bishops* in *righteousness*."[l]

---

i See p. 258, of this Essay.

k [In Dr. Miller's *second* edition (published since Dr. Cooke's Essay) he has *altered* his translation, and substituted for "*By* this succession," the words "By this *appointment and instruction*." It is *possible* that "ordinatione" may mean '*appointment*'; but it is *impossible* to translate "successione" by 'instruction.' This Dr. M. must have known. His alteration is no better than *intentional fraud*.]

l Book IV, Chapter xliv.

Digitized by Google

144. In this passage Irenæus is speaking of iniquitous Presbyters, and says, "From all such we ought to depart: but we ought to adhere to those who keep the doctrine of the Apostles, as we have before said, and with the law or discipline[m] of a Presbyter, show forth sound speech and a conversation without offence, for the information and correction of the rest." Then follows a long passage giving an account of the conduct of Moses, Samuel, and Paul in the performance of the duties imposed upon them severally: and immediately afterwards follow the words constituting the last sentence of Dr. Miller's quotation, "Such Presbyters," &c. From which it is evident that Moses, Samuel, and Paul are referred to, and that Irenæus uses the term *Presbyter* or *Elder*, in a very general way. There is certainly nothing in the passage that bears definitely on the question at issue: and nothing would be gained by taking the passage precisely as Dr. Miller has it. For the whole amount of it, as it stands, is—To such Presbyters (as with the discipline of a Presbyter, show forth sound speech, &c.) I will give *Princes* in peace and *Bishops* in righteousness—Certainly it would not appear from this form of expression, that the Presbyter was the Bishop.

145. He likewise quotes the following passage: "Obey those Presbyters (the word is *obaudire*, we ought to *hear* those Presbyters) in the Church who have the succession, as we have shown, from the Apostles; who with the succession of the episcopate, received the gift of truth, according to the good pleasure of the FATHER."[n]

146. That Irenæus was here speaking of Bishops, is concluded from the word episcopate, and from the reference to what he had said before. The marginal reference at this place is to Book I. Chap. iii: where he shows that the Church received the doctrine and faith, and although scattered over the whole world, diligently guarded it, and, as if having one soul, and one heart, in perfect concert preached, and taught, and handed down these things, as if possessing but one mouth. "And neither can he, of those who govern the Churches, (*qui præsunt Ecclesiis*) who is very able in speech, say any other things than these." Neither of the words, *Bishop* or *Presbyter*, are mentioned; but the two considerations show that Irenæus sometimes uses the word *Presbyter* in speaking of those who govern the Churches—*qui præsunt Ecclesiis*. There are three other passages in which he does the same.

---

m The passage runs thus in Irenæus: "Adhærere vero his qui et Apostolorum, sicut prædiximus, doctrinam custodiunt, et cum *Presbyteri ordine* sermonem sanum," &c. It is manifest that the words, *Presbyteri ordine*, do not signify *presbyterial succession*, as Dr. Miller has made it. To bear this signification there should be an adjective to agree with *ordine*, or the noun should be in the plural, *Presbyterorum*. As it stands, it can only mean something belonging to a Presbyter. We frequently meet with the expression *successiones Episcoporum*, not *Episcopi*; so if this passage meant presbyterial succession, or a succession of Presbyters, the word used, would have been *Presbyterorum*, not *Presbyteri*.

n IRENÆUS, Book IV. Chap. xliii.

Digitized by Google

147. It is evident, however, that he uses the word *Presbyter*, in that sense in which the Apostles were sometimes called *Elders;* according to the declaration of Hilary, "The Bishop is the chief; though every Bishop is a Presbyter, yet every Presbyter is not a Bishop."[o] This is evident, because Irenæus elsewhere speaks, in the plainest manner, *of the Church being governed by the Bishop*, BY ONE BISHOP AT A TIME, and mentions the names of twelve in succession, who *singly* governed the Church, *each in his day*, (including the very persons named in the passages quoted by Dr. Miller as Presbyters, and whom he represents as ordinary Presbyters,) at the very time that there was in Rome many thousands of Christians and numerous Presbyters. To say that Irenæus means by the word *Presbyter*, in the passage quoted by Dr. Miller, *the ordinary Presbyter*, or the Presbyter *in the common acceptation* of the word, would make him contradict himself: because these did *not govern the Church*, in the sense in which the word *præsunt* is used. It could not have been said *of any one* of the ordinary Presbyters at Rome in the time of Linus, Anacletus, or Clement—*Præest* Ecclesiæ Romæ—*he governs the Church at Rome:* But of Linus to whom 'the Apostles delivered the bishopric *to govern the Church*, it could have been said: and so likewise of Anacletus who succeeded Linus; and of Clement also, who in the third place from the Apostles obtained the bishopric. (§130.)

In one of the very letters quoted by Dr. Miller, there is a most explicit passage on this subject. In the letter to Victor, Bishop of Rome, who succeeded Eleutherius, Irenæus says, "Atque eum beatus Polycarpus, *Aniceto episcopatum administrante*, Romam adventaret;" that is, "But when the blessed Polycarp went to Rome, *Anicetus governing the bishopric*," &c. In the 3rd Chapter of the 3rd Book the same circumstance is mentioned, *viz.* Polycarp's visit to Rome *under Anicetus.*[p]

148. While remarking on this quotation from Irenæus, (§145) it will not be amiss to give the reader the sentence immediately following it. To convey the meaning fully, both sentences are given in connexion. "Wherefore we ought to hear those Presbyters who are in the Church, those who have their succession from the Apostles, as we have shown, who, with the succession of the episcopate, have received the sure gift of the truth, according to the decree of the FATHER: *But the rest who depart from the principal succession*, in whatever place they are collected, *to suspect;* either as heretics and of evil designs, or as schismatics, and puffed up, and thinking well of themselves; or again as hypocrites, doing this for the sake of lucre, and of vain-glory." And again in the same chapter: "Those who tear and divide the unity of the Church, receive from GOD the same punishment as Jeroboam."[q]

---

o See Section 56, p. 237. p See page 259.

q IRENÆUS, Book IV. Chap. xliii. See IGNATIUS' *Epistle to Philadelphians*, Sect. 3, 8: to Smyrneans, Sect. 9.

Digitized by Google

149. One statement respecting Irenæus made by Dr. Miller it is necessary to notice. He says, "Irenæus, we are told, was Bishop of the Church of Lyons in France. While he held this station he was sent by the Church of which he was Pastor, on some special ecclesiastical business to Rome. On this mission he carried with him a letter from the *Presbytery* of his Church, directed to Eleutherius, Bishop of Rome, in which he is called a *Presbyter*, and in which they style him their *brother and colleague*."[r]

150. This is a misstatement of facts, from which, notwithstanding, no benefit is to be derived. Dr. Miller has given no authority for the statement; and if he could establish it, he would make a difficulty which he would find not easy to solve. For, no Presbyter, the pastor of a Church, has a presbytery or council of Presbyters in *his Church*, who are his brothers and *colleagues*.

151. The fact is, that when this letter was written, Irenæus was not Bishop of Lyons. He was then a Presbyter, and therefore the Presbyters of that Church could with propriety call him brother and colleague: in proof of which, take the extract from Jerome, in Sect. 128, (middle of the page) and the following passage from Eusebius. He says, speaking of the sufferings of the Christians, "This account of things, the Churches of Lyons and Vienne communicated in an Epistle to the Churches of Asia and Phrygia; and likewise to Eleutherius, Bishop, in a letter which they sent by Irenæus, *then one of their Presbyters*, with a special recommendation of the person who carried it.[s]

152. The unsoundness of the argument used by Dr. Miller, (that the occasional application of the title of *Presbyter* or *Elder* to the Bishop, shows that the person using it considered them as one and the same officer in the Church,) is shown in a striking light by the fact, that it has been done by those who have expressed themselves in the most decided manner respecting the superiority of the Bishop over the Presbyter.

153. Thus Dr. Miller quotes the following from Cyprian, whom he very properly calls "the venerable Bishop of Carthage." "The people should not flatter themselves that they are free from fault, when they communicate with a sinful *priest*, and give their consent to the *presidency* of a wicked *Bishop*," &c.[t] The quotation is long and remarkably clear upon the subject, of which more perhaps may be quoted hereafter. The object at this time is to show the fallacy of concluding that a person who sometimes calls a Bishop a *Priest*, or a *Presbyter*, must intend that they are *the same*. No Bishop surely would deny that he was a Priest. Cyprian surely would not, and yet he does not hesitate to assert the superior authority of that order

---

r MILLER'S *Letters*, p. 154. [This passage is *omitted* in Dr. M.'s second edition.]
s BOWDEN'S *Letters*, Vol. I. p. 169, [Vol. I. p. 82, 2d *ed.*]
t MILLER'S *Letters*, p. 158, [p. 114, 2d *ed.*

Digitized by Google

of Priests called Bishops. He uses the following language: "What greater and better thing can I wish for, than to see the flock of CHRIST illuminated by the honour of your confession? For as it is the duty of all the brethren to rejoice on this account, so particularly the Bishop's portion of the common joy is greater, inasmuch as the glory of the Church is the *superior's* glory." "What reason have we to be afraid of the wrath of GOD, when some *Presbyters*, neither mindful of *their own station*, nor regardful of the Bishop, *their superior*, are bold to assume all to themselves, to the reproach and contempt of their *superior*, *a thing never heretofore attempted* under any of my predecessors."[u]

154. Jerome is another writer whom Dr. Miller represents on similar grounds as a decisive witness in his favour, although we have the most positive evidence to the contrary. Thus he says, "We know that what Aaron and his sons *were*, that the Bishop and Presbyters *are*." Again addressing the Church, he says, "The Apostles were thy fathers, because that they begat thee. But now that they have left the world, thou hast *in their stead* their sons, the Bishops." He asserts, "Without the Bishop's license, neither Presbyter nor Deacon has a right to baptize." He says, "It is the custom of the Church, for the Bishops to go and invoke the HOLY SPIRIT, by imposition of hands, on such as were baptized by Presbyters and Deacons, in villages and places remote from the mother Church." "Do you ask," says he, "where this is written? In the Acts of the Apostles." Speaking of the difference between the Church and *the Montanist heretics*, he says, "With us, the Bishops hold the place of the Apostles; *with them* the Bishop holds the third place."[v] He also "calls Presbyters *Priests of the inferior degree*, and Deacons the *third degree*."[v]

155. This is more than enough to show, that a man may occasionally call a Bishop a *Priest* or *a Presbyter*, without conceiving that they are of the same degree; and that Irenæus' clear and express declarations, that *the government of the Church at Rome was committed to one Bishop at a time, and successively to twelve whom he names, each in his day governing that Church*, are not to be rendered void of meaning by the circumstance of his sometimes applying to a Bishop the term *Presbyter*.

156. We have now, therefore, seen that Lardner speaks in very high terms of Irenæus; of "his learning, integrity, and good sense;"[x] and that Mosheim mentions his five books against heresies as "one of the most precious monuments of ancient literature." (§128.)

157. We have seen that this father, who was acquainted with

---

u BOWDEN'S *Letters*, Vol. I. p. 167, [Vol. I. p. 81, 2d *ed.*]
v BOWDEN'S *Letters*, Vol. I. p. 6, 7, 8. [Vol. I. p. 2, 4, 2d *ed.*]
w *Religious World Displayed, by* ROBERT ADAM, B. A. Oxford. Vol. II. p. 280.
x Vol. II. p. 157.

Digitized by Google

many of those who were taught by the Apostles, and with some who were by them appointed Bishops of the Churches, and is said to have suffered martyrdom, in other words, to have borne witness to the truth (§96) at the expense of his life, in the year 202; we have seen, that *he expressly says*, that the Apostles appointed the Bishops as their successors in the government of the Church; that he says that this was the case in all the Churches that were *in all respects faithful;* that he could enumerate the successions of Bishops *in all the Churches*, but, as this would take up too much room in one volume or book, he enumerates those only who successively governed the Church at Rome, *as a specimen of the order and government of all the others;* that, in mentioning those who governed the Church at Rome, in order, by name, he says the Apostles delivered the Church to Linus *to govern it*, and after him to Anacletus, and so on to twelve, the last of whom governed that Church at the time the book was written; and that, *by this ordination and succession* the doctrine of the Church was handed down from the Apostles, and had come even to the Christians of his day. (§130.)

158. We have moreover seen that Irenæus speaks in the most exalted terms of Polycarp, and of his Epistle to the Philippians; (p. 258,) and that Polycarp uses similar strong language in speaking of the Epistle of Ignatius, whereby the statements of Ignatius are as completely supported by the evidence of Polycarp, as if he had himself written those Epistles. (§126, 127.)

159. We have seen that the testimony of Ignatius is as strong as that of Irenæus, as to the fact that the government of the Church was in the Bishop, all ministerial authority proceeding from him;[y] but that the former is more particular with regard to the different orders; speaking *expressly*, in many places, of three orders—Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons; and in plain terms calling the latter *ministers of the mysteries of* JESUS CHRIST *and ambassadors of* GOD.[z] That he also unequivocally, in many instances, speaks of the Bishop as the object of the reverence of the other two orders, and of their being subject to him.[a] That he speaks of *the Presbyters being particularly bound to refresh the Bishop;*[b] and as having no authority but what they derive from him, even to administer the sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper:[c] And lastly, that these orders are all essential, and that he expressly says, *without them there is no Church.*[d]

160. Of this state of things in the Church, evidence more and

---

y See §118, 123, with the references to the Epistles of Ignatius in the Appendix.

z Epistle to the Trallians, Sect. 2; Magnesians, Sect. 6; Philadelphians, Sect. 10, 11.

a See Epistle to the Magnesians, Sect. 2, 3, and the passages in italics generally, in the Epistles of Ignatius in the Appendix.

b Epistle to the Trallians, Sect. 12.

c Epistle to the Smyrneans, Sect. 8.

d Epistle to the Trallians, Sect. 3.

Digitized by Google

more abounds as we progress through the third century, because more and more learning was enlisted in the cause of the Christian religion, and because more of the writings of the fathers of the succeeding centuries have been preserved. It is, however, needless to carry the investigation further, for two reasons.

161. First, it is admitted by all, that the government of the Church, from the reformation up to a very early period, was episcopal; and the controversy relates to the nature of the government *only during the time between the commencement of the preaching of the Gospel and that period in which it is admitted that the Church was episcopal.*

162. The most learned Presbyterian writers admit that the Church was episcopal in the year 140. The Provincial Assembly of London, in the appendix to the *Jus Divinum Ministerii Anglicani* ask this question—"How long was it that the Church of CHRIST was governed by the common council of Presbyters without a Bishop set over them?" To which they thus answered, "Dr. Blondel, a man of great learning and reading, undertakes in a large discourse, to make out that before the year 140, there was not a Bishop set over Presbyters; to whose elaborate writings we refer the reader for further satisfaction in this particular." Blondel in his preface, "labours to prove that the change of government was made at Jerusalem, about the year 135 or 136; at Alexandria about the year 143, and at Rome about the year 140."[a]

It has however been shown that the Church was episcopal throughout the first two centuries, and consequently throughout the period in controversy; and therefore it is not necessary to prosecute the inquiry further.

163. The second reason is, that if the fact be established that the Church was episcopal in its government for the first two centuries; even if it should be made evident that it was Presbyterian in the next five, it would only be evidence that the Church had departed from the apostolical plan. Having therefore established the fact, that the Church was for two centuries episcopal, it is unnecessary to inquire further into the matter. We are under the most positive obligations to conform to the apostolical form of government of the Church; and if it should be made to appear that we have departed from it, *we are bound to return to it.* This is an obligation so far from being questioned, that *it is a first principle not barely admitted, but laid down as a fundamental position*, by Dr. Miller himself. His words are, "If all the interests of the Church are precious in the view of every enlightened Christian, it is evident that *the mode of its organization* cannot be a trivial concern; and if the SAVIOUR, *or those who were immediately taught by his* SPIRIT, have laid down any rules, or given us any information on this subject, it behoves us carefully to study what they have delivered, *and to*

---

a BOWDEN'S *Letters*, Vol. III. p. 82, 83, [Vol. II. p. 38, 2d *ed*]

Digitized by Google

make it our constant guide." And again he says, "We unite with such of them as hold the opinion, *that Christians*, IN ALL AGES, *are bound to make the apostolic order of the Church, with respect to the ministry*, as well as other points, *the model, as far as possible, of all their ecclesiastical arrangements.*"[f]

164. But although it is not necessary, strictly speaking, to proceed with this investigation regularly through the third and fourth centuries, it may not be amiss to make some remarks upon the semblance of argument on this subject, derived from other writers than those heretofore mentioned.

165. Clemens Romanus is quoted by Dr. Miller in support of the doctrine, that there is but one order of ministers. He was the third Bishop of Rome, in which city there were numerous Presbyters. It will subsequently appear that there were forty-six of this order of ministers under one of his successors.

Clement and the Church of Rome, in order to compose a disturbance in which the Corinthians had deposed their priests, (all of them it appears,) wrote a very long letter to them, fully as long as the whole seven Epistles of Ignatius together, in which he uses every possible argument to induce them to return to a quiet and orderly state. Very little mention is made of the Priests, against whom they were violently excited. He mentions once *Bishops and Deacons*, and once *Presbyters*, and in a third place *the chief Priest, the Priests, and the Levites.*[g]

The third, Dr. Miller objects to admitting as applicable to the Christian Church. But they to whom the letter was addressed, were not Jews, and he mentions these orders of the priests in connexion with the services GOD required of *them, who were Gentiles;* and half a century before that, it had been determined by the Jewish Christians, that the Gentiles were not bound to regard the Jewish ceremonies. Let this be as it may; it is certain, first, that the mention of two orders is destructive, as far as this testimony goes, of that doctrine which insists only on one; and as far as it goes, supports that which insists on three: for, two are mentioned, and one of the terms, *Presbyter* or *Priest*, is a general one, sometimes used to include Bishop, (§56, p. 237) and is even applied to the Apostles.

But further, Polycarp is likewise quoted by Dr. Miller as being an aid in support of the doctrine, that there is but one order of ministers; and he commences with saying, "This venerable martyr, like Clemens, speaks of only *two orders* of Church officers, viz. *Presbyters and Deacons*. He exhorts the Philippians to obey these officers in the LORD." "The word *Bishop* is no where mentioned in his whole Epistle; nor does he give the most distant hint as if there was any individual or body of men vested with power superior to Presbyters."[h]

This is a most extraordinary declaration. An ancient father

---

f MILLER'S *Letters*, p. 6, 8, [p. 3, 4, 2d *ed.*]
g Sections 40, 42, 44, h MILLER'S *Letters*, p. 138. [p. 88, 89, 2d *ed.*]

Digitized by Google

is quoted to prove the truth of the doctrine that there is *but one* order of ministers, when it is roundly admitted in the very outset that he *speaks of two*, and when we know that he himself belonged to *a third*. But independently of this circumstance, does the omission of the name of an officer, in an Epistle not written on the subject, prove that there is no such officer? Polycarp says in this very letter, "the Epistles of Ignatius which he wrote unto us, together with what others of his have come to our hands, we have sent to you according to your order; which are subjoined to this epistle; by which you may be greatly profited; for they treat of faith and patience, *and of all things that pertain to edification in the* LORD JESUS."[i] One of these epistles was written to him, and another to the Church at Smyrna, over which he presided. His is addressed to "Polycarp, *Bishop* of the Church which is at Smyrna," &c. Polycarp's own letter is directed, "Polycarp and the Presbyters that are with him to the Church of GOD which is at Philippi," &c. In the letter to Polycarp, Ignatius tells him, "Let nothing be done without *thy* knowledge and consent."[k] In that to the Smyrneans there is enough to satisfy any man of the sentiments of Polycarp, shown by his approbation of the contents.[l]

166. If no ancient writer had mentioned Bishops as a separate and superior order of ministers, the omission would have shown that there were none. But when all but a few mention them, it is absurd to argue their non-existence from the silence of the few.

If all Ignatius' Epistles, except that to the Romans, had been lost, the argument for the non-existence of Bishops as a separate order, would have been strengthened by the circumstance that that name is but once mentioned in that Epistle, and that no other order is mentioned at all; so that we cannot determine anything on the subject from the Epistle to the Romans. The loss of all the Epistles of Ignatius except that to the Romans, would have been the more unfortunate, because we should thereby have been deprived of the benefit of the evidence of Polycarp; the latter consisting only of a full assent to the testimony that Ignatius had previously given: which, though as positive as that which is assented to, requires the knowledge of what that is, in order to our determining what itself amounts to.

If, therefore, the Epistles of Ignatius, except that to the Romans, had been lost, we should have had one Epistle from each of three very remarkable men, living in the first and second centuries of the existence of the Christian Church, without any express mention, in either of them, of Bishops as a separate order, superior to Presbyters. But the preservation of the other Epistles of Ignatius, besides that to the Romans, shows in the most striking manner, that a man may write a letter to a Church,

i Sect. 13.

k Sect. 4.

l See the Epistle to the Smyrneans in the Appendix.

Digitized by Google

scarcely mentioning a single order of ministers; at the same time that in other epistles he may, in the most marked manner, state the number and the powers of the different orders. Had, therefore, all the Epistles of Polycarp and of Clement been preserved, it is plain from the case of Ignatius, that we might have had as ample testimony from their epistles, in support of the three orders, as we actually have from his.

That we could not have any thing of an opposite character from Polycarp, is evident from the circumstance of his being himself Bishop of the Church at Smyrna, with Presbyters under him; which appears from a comparison of the address of Ignatius' Epistle to Polycarp, with the address of Polycarp's Epistle to the Philippians. In the former he is called Bishop, in the latter he speaks of *the Presbyters with him*. That Polycarp does not style himself Bishop, is no evidence that he did not occupy that station in the Church at Smyrna. Ignatius does not in one instance style himself Bishop.

That we should not have any thing of an opposite character from Clement, is evident from the circumstance of his being Bishop of the Church at Rome, and having numerous Presbyters under him. One of Clement's successors, about 150 years after him, had forty-six Presbyters and seven Deacons under him.[m]

167. Dr. Miller quotes[n] "Papias Bishop of Hierapolis, a city of Asia, said to have been 'a hearer of John and a companion of Polycarp.' He flourished about the year 110 or 115." "The only thing," he says, "remarkable in this passage, is, that the writer, obviously, styles the *Apostles*, *Presbyters*." This might have been shown as easily by quoting the New Testament. See on this subject Section 56, (p. 237) and Section 147 of this Essay.

168. He also quotes[o] Justin Martyr, (whose works I have not been able to procure) to show that *the president of the brethren* officiated at the public assemblies for worship; a passage entirely destitute of bearing on the subject, as far as I am able to judge. *The president of the brethren* is he who presides, without designation of order. The Bishop presides if he be present. The Presbyters preside in his absence. In absence of both, the Deacons. The question in debate is not who presides; but who is the source of authority to preside.

This very passage, like almost every one quoted by Dr. Miller, is destructive of his system of church government, by containing evidence of *more than one order* of ministers. The *president* distributes the bread and wine, "and to those that are absent it is sent by the Deacons."[p] See with respect to their ministerial characters, Sections 41, 120.

169. The testimony of Clemens Alexandrinus, a Presbyter of the Church at Alexandria, Dr. Miller thinks, as he does that of

---

m EUSEBIUS, *Eccles. Hist.* Book VI, Chap. 43, quoted by BOWDEN, *Letters*, Vol. I. p. 74. [Vol. I. p. 37, 2d *ed.*]

n *Letters*, p. 149. [p. 97, 2d *ed.*]

o *Letters*, p. 155. [p. 101, 2d *ed.*]

p *Letters*, p. 156. [p. 102, 2d *ed.*]

Digitized by Google

Ignatius, in favour of the doctrine of one order of ministers in the Church.

170. He quotes the following: "*We* who have *rule over the Churches*, are Shepherds or Pastors, after the image of the good Shepherd."[q] There is nothing in this contrary to the doctrine of three orders. The Presbyters do rule the Chnrches in subordination to the Bishop. Paul says, *Let the Elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honour*, in the same chapter[r] in which, instructing Timothy how to deal with these Elders, he says, *Them that sin, rebuke before all, that others* (the others, OF THE REST) *also may fear*."[s]

171. Again, speaking of the impropriety of women wearing the hair of others, Clement says, "On whom or what will the *Presbyter* impose his hand? To whom or what will he give his blessing? Not to the woman who is adorned, but to strange locks of hair, and through them to another's head."[t] Here a Presbyter confirms, which being (Dr. Miller argues) the office of a Bishop, it is evident that Bishops and Presbyters are one.[u] To this it is replied, that in Egypt it was the custom, *when the Bishop was absent*, for the Presbyters to confirm. "Apud Egyptum Presbyteri confirmant, si præsens non sit Episcopus."[v] This very exception proves the rule, that it was the Bishop's special duty. It was only when he was absent that the Presbyters confirmed: and moreover the statement that *in Egypt* this was the custom, implies that it was not the common practice of the Church. It is evident therefore that the conclusion from this circumstance, that Bishop and Presbyter are one, is exactly the reverse of what fairly flows from it, when *all the facts* are stated.

172. Dr. Miller also quotes a long passage to show that Clement, in speaking of the Bishop in one instance, calls him a Presbyter. It has been already fully shown that this is sometimes the case with those who unquestionably assert a difference between them;[w] for the reason, that Bishops are Presbyters or Elders, but all Presbyters are not Bishops. (§56.) And this distinction is as completely made by Clement as by other writers. He says, "Now in the Church here, the progressions of Bishops, Presbyters, Deacons, I deem to be imitations of the evangelical glory," &c. "Many other commands, appertaining to select persons, are written in the sacred book; some to *Presbyters*, some to *Bishops*, some to *Deacons*, and some to widows."[x] Can any man conceive that Clement in these passages had in view a ministry of a single order?

---

q *Letters*, p. 157. [p. 103, 2d *ed.*]

r 1 Tim. v.

s See the note to p. 225 of this Essay.

t MILLER'S *Letters*, p. 158, [p. 103, 2d *ed.*]

u *Letters*, p. 161, [p. 105, 2d *ed.*]

v *Com. q. vulgo* AMBROS. *dic. in 4 cap. Epis. ad Ephes.* §9. See HOOKER, Vol. II. p. 256, note.

w Sect. 155, and preceding Sections.

x MILLER'S *Letters*, p. 158, 159, [p. 103, 2d *ed.*]

Digitized by Google

173. Dr. Miller next quotes Tertullian, whom he also thinks a supporter of the doctrine he maintains. He brings forward the following passages. 1. "In our religious assemblies certain approved *Elders preside*, who have obtained their office by merit, and not by bribes." 2. "We receive the sacrament of the Lord's Supper from the hands of none but the *Presidents* of our assemblies." 3. "Before we go to the water to be baptized, we first, in the Church, under the hand of the *President* profess to renounce the devil." 4. "It remains that I remind you of the custom of giving and receiving Baptism. The right of giving this ordinance belongs to the highest Priest, who is the *Bishop*. Then to the *Elders* and *Deacons*, yet not without the authority of the Bishop, for the sake of the honour of the Church. This being secured, peace is secured; otherwise, even the *laity* have the right."[y]

174. On these quotations Dr. Miller remarks, "This father tells us, that in his day, *Presbyters presided* in their assemblies; that the *Presidents* of their assemblies *alone*, in ordinary cases, *baptized*; and that they received the Lord's Supper from no other hands but those of the *Presidents*; and at the same time he informs us, that administering *baptism* is the appropriate right of *the highest Priest, who is the Bishop*. What," he says "are we to infer from this representation, but that *Presbyter*, *President*, and *Bishop*, are employed by Tertullian as titles of the same import?"[z]

175. The first of these quotations (§173) was found after long search over sixty-seven pages folio (Dr. Miller having omitted references in too many instances) at p. 67 of Tertullian's *Apology for the Christians against the Nations*. The words are, "Præsident probati quique *seniores*, honorem istum non pretio, sed testimonio adepti." "Certain approved *seniors* (or *old men*) preside, having obtained that honour by merit, not for a price. Presbyters are not mentioned. Addressing the Heathen nations in general, it was sufficiently explicit to say that *certain approved old men* presided; and this term is so general that it certainly does not indicate Presbyters particularly.

176. The second and third quotations in Section 173, are taken from Tertullian's book written concerning a Christian soldier, who would not wear on his head a crown he had received as a reward of merit, and was hurried to prison covered with his own blood. The third precedes the second in Tertullian. See Chap. iii.

177. In this sentence, (the third in §173,) the word Dr. Miller has translated *President*, is ANTISTES. *Antistes*, Ainsworth says, signifies *properly* A CHIEF PRIEST, PRELATE, BISHOP, *or* ABBOT, *but is also used for a chief man, or one who is eminent among others.*

178. In this sense Tacitus uses it in speaking of Ignatius in

y MILLER's *Letters*, p. 170, [p. 111, 2d *ed.*]

z *Ibid.* p. 171, [p. 112, 2d *ed.*]

Digitized by Google

his life of Trajan, Section xci. "Ignatius, Antiochiæ Christianorum ANTISTES, difficilia tempora, quibus multi periere, erat elapsus; cum tandem accusatus, coram Trajano sistere se jussus est. Is pervicax perstitit, seque Theophorum dicebat. Trajanus jubet, eum comprehendi, duci Romam, et in amphitheatro bestiis objici; ut populus Romanus Theophori spectaculo fruatur." "Ignatius, the Bishop of the Christians at Antioch, had escaped the difficult times in which many had perished; when at length being accused, he was commanded to present himself before Trajan. He continued immoveable, and called himself Theophorus. Trajan commanded him to be taken, to be led to Rome, and to be cast to beasts in the amphitheatre; that the Roman people might enjoy the sight of Theophorus."[a]

179. In the second quotation in Section 173, the word translated *Presidents*, is in Tertullian *Præsidentium*. This word is a participle and signifies *presiding persons*, and does not designate the office they bore. *Præses* is the word for *President*.

180. The whole passage, including both these sentences, runs thus: "Finally, that I may commence with Baptism, *About to go to the water, we profess there, but likewise a little before in the Church, under the hand of the Bishop, that we renounce the devil*, and his service, and his angels. And then we are three times immersed, doing somewhat more than our LORD appointed in the Gospel. Thence being taken up we taste a mixture of milk and honey;—and from that day we abstain from the daily bath for a whole week. *We take the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper*, commanded to all by our LORD, at the season of eating, even in our meetings before day-light, *nor from the hand of any others than the presiding persons*."[b] The words in italics correspond with what Dr. Miller has quoted.

181. It is to be remarked that the most solemn time of baptizing was from the feast of the Passover until the day of Pentecost.[c] During this solemn time, the new converts, after frequent prayers, fastings, and watchings, with confession of all their sins,[d] being about to go to the water, renounced under the hand of the Bishop, the devil, &c. and afterwards received the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper from the hands of *the presiding persons*.

182. The question is, who are these presiding persons? They could not mean the Bishop alone: for there was but one Bishop in a city according to the unanimous voice of the fathers. (§130, 131, 147.) And accordingly in the passages quoted by Dr. Mil-

---

a Tacitus mentions Ignatius again in Section xcv. in the following manner, "Meantime Ignatius, whom we have above mentioned, had arrived at Rome. When the sports were about to close, on the 13th of the kalends of January, he was cast to lions and immediately torn to pieces, being more greedy of death, than the mass of mankind are of life. The same alacrity of the Christians was seen not only in the city, but in the provinces: and it was of service to them; for it was a shame to punish with death, those to whom it was a pleasure to die."

b TERTULLIANI *De Corona Militis Liber*, Cap. iii.

c TERTULLIANI *De Bap. Lib.* Cap. xix.

d *Ibid.* Cap. xx.

Digitized by Google

ler, (§173, 3) the word *antistitis* is singular, though in order to draw his conclusion in Section 174, he has been obliged to make it plural, *presidents*.

183. The question (§182) is answered even by the very passage quoted by Dr. Miller in Section 173, marked 4; which runs thus in Tertullian: "Superest ad concludendam materiolam de observatione quoque dandi et accipiendi baptismum commonefacere. *Dandi quidem habet jus summus sacerdos, qui est Episcopus. Dehinc Presbyteri et Diaconi,* NON TAMEN SINE EPISCOPI AUCTORITATE *propter Ecclesiæ honorem.* Quo salvo, salva pax est. Alioquin etiam laicis jus est."[e] "It remains to remind you, &c. *The highest Priest, who is the Bishop, has the right of baptizing. After him the Presbyters and Deacons, not however without the permission of the Bishop, on account of the honour of the Church,*" &c. And this also agrees with the unanimous voice of the fathers, that the Presbyters and the Deacons, by virtue of authority given them by the Bishop, administered Baptism. They therefore, together with the Bishop, were the *presiding persons:* and in his absence, likewise, they were the presiding persons, and had authority from the Bishop, by virtue of their ordination, to baptize, and to do *those things necessary to the exercise of religion;* but there were things that they could not do, as appears not only from the Epistles of Cyprian; of which one has been already quoted, (§153) and others will presently be produced.[f]

184. Dr. Miller's inference, therefore, in Section 174, is without foundation; indeed, to conclude that Bishop and Presbyter are one, in the face of such a quotation as the last from Tertullian, is doing such violence to language, that too much time has, perhaps, been devoted to pointing it out.

185. The following passages from Tertullian will further show how extremely absurd it is, to quote detached sentences without reference to the circumstances in which the piece was written, or to whom, and by means of them to endeavour to explain away the clearest expressions. Tertullian speaking of heresies, says: "But if any dare to mingle themselves with the Apostolic age, that thus they may appear to be handed down from the Apostles, because they were under the Apostles, we can say: Let them then produce the origins of their Churches: let them declare the series of their Bishops, so running down from the beginning by successions, that that first Bishop may have some one of the Apostles, or apostolic men who yet continued constant with the Apostles, for their author and predecessor. For, in this manner the apostolical Churches trace their origin: as the Church of the Smyrneans, having Polycarp, relates that he was placed with them by John. As the Church of the Romans tells of Clement ordained by Peter: in like manner also the rest

---

e TERTUL. *De Bap. Lib.* Cap. xvii.

f See §191, 192, 194, 197 to 203, and most of the passages in italics in Ignatius' Epistles in the Appendix.

Digitized by Google

of them show that they have grafts of the apostolic seed, who were appointed to the Bishopric by the Apostles. Let the heretics do any thing like this."[g]

186. It is worth remarking here, that Tertullian who lived at the same time with Irenæus, the former a Presbyter in Carthage and the latter a Bishop of the Church at Lyons in France, agree entirely. It is also observable that they both wrote against heretics, and the challenge with which the last quotation from Tertullian concludes, shows the confidence he felt that what is there stated could not be contradicted.

187. The following short quotation is of the same import. "We have Churches, the foster-children of John. For if Marcion denies his Revelation, nevertheless the succession of Bishops rehearsed to the beginning will stand in John their author. Thus likewise the excellency of the rest is recognized."[h]

188. The next father quoted by Dr. Miller is Cyprian, who was ordained Bishop of Carthage in the year 248, having before that time been a Presbyter, according to the testimony of his Deacon Pontius, and of Eusebius and Jerome, quoted by Dr. Bowden.[i]

In the passage quoted in Section 153, ("The people should not," &c.) there is mention of a Priest and a Bishop, which is repeated in the sentences following that quoted: but to say nothing of the obvious truth that a Bishop is a Priest, (Sect. 56, p. 237, and Sect. 155) there is nothing in this sentence to show that Cyprian was speaking of the same character. The language would be perfectly proper if he was speaking of two, both Bishop and Priest; and what follows shortly after, shows that he had no idea of there being one order of ministers only.

He says, "And we may take notice that the Apostles observed this, not only in the ordination of Bishops and Priests, but also of Deacons," &c. Here are the three orders directly mentioned in the same epistle: and in the 32d, "Seeing a Church consists of a Bishop, Clergy, and all that stand faithful."[k]

189. The following is another passage quoted by Dr. Miller:[l] "The Deacons ought to remember, that the LORD hath chosen Apostles, that is *Bishops and Presidents;* but the Apostles constituted Deacons, as the ministers of their episcopacy, and of the Church." In this passage Bishops and Apostles are spoken of as one. Presbyters are not mentioned, because Cyprian is comparing Bishops and Deacons; and therefore these two orders only are mentioned.

190. The existence of these three orders of ministers is clearly expressed by Cyprian on many occasions. While Bishop

---

g TERTULLIAN *against the Heretics*, Chapter xxxii.
h TERTULL. *against Marcion*, Book IV. Chapter v,
i *Letters*. Vol. I. p. 96. [Vol. I. p. 48. 2d *ed.*]
k MILLER'S *Letters*, p. 175, 176. [p. 114, 2d *ed.*]
l *Letters*, p. 176. [p. 114, 2d *ed.*]

Digitized by Google

of Carthage he was induced by threats of being thrown to lions to conceal himself for a time. In his concealment he continued to govern the Church by letters to his Presbyters.

191. In his 41st Epistle we are informed that he deputed two Bishops and two of his Presbyters "to examine the ages, qualifications, and merits of some in Carthage, that he whose province it was to promote men to ecclesiastical offices, might be well informed about them, and promote none but such as were meek, humble, and worthy."[m]

192. In his 59th Epistle he says, "Is glory given to GOD, when *Presbyters*, contemning and trampling on *their Bishops*, should preach peace with deceiving words, and give the communion," &c.[n] See two other striking passages of similar import, from Cyprian, in the 153d Section of this Essay.

193. "When Cyprian sent Numidicus to be placed among the Presbyters of Carthage, he gives this reason for it; 'that he might adorn *the plenty of his Presbyters* with such worthy men, it being now impaired by the fall of some,' that is during the persecution."[o] and speaking again of the same person, Cyprian says, "It is the pleasure of our LORD, that he should be joined with our clergy, and that our numbers which the lapse of some Presbyters hath diminished, should be recruited, and adorned with such illustrious Priests."[p]

194. His 39th Epistle "runs thus, 'Cyprian to his Presbyters and Deacons, and to all the people, his brethren, sendeth greeting.'" The quotations given just above, (§192, 193) show that these were *Presbyters* in the proper sense of the word, who in subordination to the Bishop governed the Church, administered the Sacrament, &c. Cyprian's writings abound with passages totally irreconcileable with the scheme of presbyterian government, and as completely consonant to the episcopal. He says in one place, "Yea, it is not a matter left to our own free choice, whether Bishops shall rule or no, but the will of our LORD and Saviour is, that every act of the Church be governed by her Bishops."[q]

195. The number of Presbyters under Cyprian is not known. —He however mentions eight besides some who had lapsed in the persecution.[r] At one time six Presbyters left the Church, and after that Cyprian mentions three by name as being the chief or principal Presbyters.[s] There were at least six churches in Carthage mentioned by name, besides two great churches without the city: one where Cyprian suffered martyrdom, and the other in which he was buried. And 'I do not question,'

---

m BOWDEN'S *Letters*, Vol. I. p. 100. [Vol. I. p. 49, 2d *ed.*]
n *Ibid.* Vol. I. p. 104. [Vol. I. p. 52, 2d *ed.*]
o *Ibid.* Vol. I. p. 65. [Vol. I. p. 35, 2d *ed.*] p *Ibid.*
q *Ibid.* Vol. I. p. 67. [Vol. I. p. 34, 2d *ed.*] HOOKER Vol. II. p. 259.
r *Ibid.* Vol. I. p. 70. [Vol. I. p. 35, 2d *ed.*]
s *Ibid.* p. 66. [Vol. I. p. 33, 2d *ed.*]

Digitized by Google

says Stillingfleet, 'there were many others which I have not observed;'[t] &c.

196. This notice of Cyprian must not be dismissed without remarking on some extraordinary assertions of Dr. Miller. Comparing the powers of the Bishop and Presbyter, he says, "And in what respects he (Cyprian) differed from the other *Presbyters*, whether only as a standing *chairman* or *moderator* among them, as seems to be intimated by his calling them repeatedly his *colleagues* or *co-presbyters*, we are no where informed. All we know is, that writing to them in his exile, he requests them, during his absence, to perform *his duties* as well as *their own*: which looks as if Cyprian considered the Presbyters of his Church as clothed with full power to perform all those acts which were incumbent on him as *Bishop*, and consequently as of the *same order* with himself."[u]

197. *In what respects he differed from the other Presbyters, &c. we are no where informed*, says Dr. Miller, (§196.) See what Cyprian says, in Sections 153, 191, 192, 194, with regard to the difference between him and his Presbyters.

198. *All we know is*, that writing to them in his exile, *he requests them*, &c. says Dr. Miller, (§196.)

Cyprian's words are not quoted. The defect is here supplied from Hooker:[v] "By these letters *I both exhort and command*, that ye whose presence there is not envied at, nor so much beset with dangers, supply my room in doing those things which *the exercise of religion* doth require."

199. —— *Which looks as if Cyprian considered the Presbyters of the same order with himself*, says Dr. Miller, (§196.) But what says Cyprian to this? While he *exhorts and commands* the Presbyters to supply his room in doing those things which *the exercise of religion requires*, his letters show that he exercised even in his exile *his peculiar powers*, and that he reprobates any attempt of the Presbyters to exceed their subordinate authority, and encroach on *his superior power*. (§191, 192, 194, 153.)

200. Cyprian was chosen Bishop when he had been but a short time a Christian. He assumed the office with reluctance; and was in the habit of consulting his Presbyters and Deacons on most occasions. Writing when in exile, to the Presbyters and Deacons, and informing them that he had ordained Aurelius a reader in the Church, he says, "In all ecclesiastical ordinations, most dear brethren, I used to consult you beforehand, and to examine the manners and merits of every one with common advice."[w] Here he speaks of what he chose to do; *I used to consult you*, implying the right to do it or not.

201. But although he treated them with such deference and

---

t BOWDEN, p. 70. [Vol. I. p. 35, 2d *ed.*]
u *Letters*, p. 177. [p. 115, 116, 2d *ed.*]
v Vol. II. p. 259.
w BOWDEN, Vol. I. p. 100. [Vol. I. p. 49, 2d *ed.*]

Digitized by Google

respect, he was very far from considering the Presbyters of his Church in the light Dr. Miller would have his readers believe.—(§196.)

The Presbyters in the absence of Cyprian had admitted the lapsed to the communion without having exacted the full penance, and without his consent. He wrote to them several letters on the subject, sharply reproving them, in which he uses the following expressions.

"I have long preserved my patience, very dear brethren," &c. "For what danger ought we not to fear from giving offence to the LORD, when some Presbyters, neither mindful of the Gospel, nor of their own place, nor bearing in mind the future judgment of the LORD, nor the Bishop now set over them, assume all (power) to themselves with the injury and contempt of him that is set over them, which was never done at all under our predecessors." In addition to this plain assertion of his own superiority, he suspended the persons who had been received until he should return, and promised them a fair hearing before him, in the presence of the confessors and all the people.[x]

202. Cyprian in his two next Epistles, (10th and 11th) says more on this subject, telling the Presbyters that they ought to have asked the Bishop's leave, "as was always done in time past under our predecessors." And upon its being alleged that the confessors, whose requests were almost always granted, had interceded for the lapsed, he writes, that the confessors should have kept their petitions for the Bishop to consider, and because they did not, in so doing, "reserve for the Bishop the honour of his office and chair," he suspended them, as before mentioned; until he might be able to return and examine their cases.[y]

203. With like views, Cyprian, in his Epistle to Rogatianus, who complained to him of a Deacon who had abused him, his Bishop, writes, "Exercise the power of your office upon him, and either suspend him or depose him." He likewise commends Cornelius, Bishop of Rome, for driving Felicissimus, the schismatic, from the Church, "with full authority as becomes a Bishop."[z]

204. Dr. Miller says, "Firmilian, Bishop of Cæsarea, who was contemporary with Cyprian, in an Epistle addressed to the latter, has the following passage. CYPRIAN. *Epist.* 75: 'But the other heretics, also, if they separate from the Church, can have no power or grace, since all power and grace are placed in the Church, where *Elders* preside, in whom is vested the power of baptizing and imposition of hands, and *ordination*."[a]

205. In this very letter, however, Firmilian says, "How is this, that when we see Paul baptized his disciples again after John's baptism, we should make any doubt of baptizing them who return from heresy to the Church, after that unlawful and *profane* baptism of theirs, unless Paul was less *than these Bishops of whom we are speaking now*," &c.[b]

x TAYLOR'S *Works*, Vol. VII., p. 163. y *Ibid.* z *Ibid.*
a MILLER'S *Letters*, p. 179. [p. 117, 2d *ed.*]
b BOWDEN, Vol. I. p. 138. [Vol. I. p. 67, 2d *ed.*

Digitized by Google

206. In his 75th Epistle he says, "Where we may observe, that the power of remitting sins was granted to the Apostles, and to those Churches which they, when sent forth by CHRIST, formed and founded, and *to those Bishops who succeeded them, in a due and regular course of vicarious succession.* Under what other notion can we, therefore, consider these adversaries of the one Catholic Church, whereof we are members, these enemies of ours, OF US, *I say, who are successors of the Apostles,*" &c.[c]

207. From a comparison of these quotations, (§204 to 206) it is manifest that they were Bishops whom he speaks of under the name of *Elders* in the first, (§204.) Being a Bishop and calling himself a Bishop and a successor of the Apostles, (§206) he must have had the same powers with other Bishops of the age, such as Cyprian, with Presbyters under him: consequently he did not mean to call those who were Bishops, Presbyters in the inferior sense. It has been already shown that some writers occasionally used the general term Presbyter, or Priest, in speaking of the Bishop, (§155 and preceding Sections,) and the following quotation from Jerome, (who, according to Dr. Miller, is a decisive witness in his favour,) is an instance of the application of the word Priest to the Bishop, at the same time that the superiority of the latter is declared. Advising Nepotian, Jerome says, "Be thou subject unto thy Bishop, and receive him as the father of thy soul. This also I say, that Bishops should know themselves to be Priests, and not Lords; that they ought to honour the clergy as becometh the clergy to be honoured, to the end their clergy may yield them the honour which, as Bishops, they ought to have."[d] See 3rd Section of the Epistle of Ignatius to the Magnesians, and the 12th of that to the Trallians, for passages enforcing this obligation of the Presbyters to honour the Bishop.

208. The preceding Sections had been put to press when a very strange objection to the testimony of Irenæus was observed in turning over the leaves of Dr. Miller's *Reply* to Dr. Bowden.

209. Irenæus states that the Apostles left the Bishops as their successors in the Churches, delivering to them their own places of governors; and that having founded and instructed and built up the Church at Rome, they delivered to Linus the bishopric, to govern the Church. To him succeeded Anacletus; after him, in the third place from the Apostles, Clement obtained the Bishopric; who both saw the Apostles themselves, and conferred with them, &c. To Clement succeeded Evaristus; and Alexander to Evaristus, and so on to twelve, (§130.)

Thus the Bishopric was delivered to one person and after his death to another; and so on, *to one at a time.* But we know that there were many Presbyters at the same time in Rome,

---

c BOWDEN, Vol. I. p. 140. [Vol. I. p. 68, 2d *ed.*]
d HOOKER, Vol. II, p. 263.

Digitized by Google

Under Cornelius there were forty-six,[e] and Paul incidentally mentions eight συνεργοι, *fellow-labourers*, or helpers in the Gospel, besides to διακονοι, *Deacons*, or ministers.[f]

210. To the question, Why does Irenæus single out Linus, Anacletus, &c. (§209) as successive Bishops of the Church at Rome, when there were many others in that Church at the same time, who, according to the Presbyterian doctrine, were all equal to the one singled out by name?—Dr. Miller has no other reply to make than this, *that the statement of Irenæus is not to be relied on.* In support of this he makes the following observations.

211. Irenæus 'says that Anacletus was before Clemens, and next to Linus. Tertullian and several others assure us, that Clemens was next to Peter, and of course before Anacletus. Epiphanius and Optatus say that Anacletus and Cletus were before Clemens. While Augustin, Damasus, and others, assert that Anacletus, Cletus, and Linus, were all antecedent to Clemens. Here is perfect confusion.'[g]

212. Dr. Miller has given no references, and after long search I have found Tertullian's and Epiphanius' lists. They do not agree with Dr. Miller's statements.

Tertullian's list is as follows: Linus, Cletus, Anacletus, Clemens, Evaristus, &c. agreeing entirely with Irenæus except in the introduction of the name *Cletus* after Linus.[h]

Epiphanius' list is as follows, after Peter and Paul: Linus and Cletus, Clemens, Evaristus, &c. agreeing with Irenæus except in the substitution of the name *Cletus* for Anacletus, and the mention of Evaristus's name twice.[i]

To the other authors I have not access, but it is not material, inasmuch as Dr. Miller says Optatus agrees with Epiphanius, and Augustin and Damasus mention the same names as preceding Clemens, that Tertullian does.

---

e EUSEB. *Eccl. Hist.* Lib. VI. cap. xliii.

f These are Urbane, our helper in CHRIST, συνεργον, the same title which Paul gives Timothy in the same chapter; verse 21, (Rom. xvi. 9;) Aquila and Prisca, or Priscilla, (Prisca according to Griesbach) my helpers, συνεργους, (the same title in the accusative plural,) (Rom. xvi. 3;) Marcus, Aristarchus, Jesus, who is called Justus, my fellow-workers, συνεργοι, (the same title in the nominative plural,) (Coloss. iv. 10, 11;) the two former likewise, with Luke, and Demas who afterwards left him in Rome, are styled fellow-labourers, συνεργοι, in the Epistle to Philemon, 24th verse. Besides these eight who are called by somewhat different titles in our translation of the New Testament, but all by the same in the original, συνεργοι, there were two others, Epaphras and Tychicus.

Epaphras is called a servant of CHRIST, (Coloss. iv. 12,) δουλος, and our dear fellow-servant, συνδουλου, and faithful minister of CHRIST, διακονος, or deacon of CHRIST, (Coloss. i. 7.) Tychicus is called a faithful minister in the LORD, (Ephes. vi. 21,) διακονος, or deacon in the LORD; and also a faithful minister and fellow-servant in the LORD, διακονος, or faithful deacon and fellow-servant in the LORD. (Coloss. iv. 7.)

Besides these ten, there were Linus and Clemens, both of whom were afterwards Bishops of the Church at Rome, (§130.)

g MILLER'S *Reply to Bowden*, p. 174. [p. 327, 2d *ed.*]

h TERTUL. *adversus Marcion.* Lib. III. cap. ix.

i EPIPHANIUS, *Bishop, against the Heresies*, Book I., Heresy 27.

Digitized by Google

213. The whole difference, then, is in the names intervening between Linus and Clemens. They are almost the same, and might easily be mistaken one for the other. And if Dr. Miller, who lives in an age when the art of printing has so multiplied books, has such mistakes as those above stated, it certainly would not be a strange thing if some of those who, in the scarcity of manuscripts in ancient times, often quoted from memory, were to mis-spell the name of Cletus or Anacletus, and thus in process of time cause some to have one name, others to have the other, and a third set to have both in their writings. After this was written I met with the following observation in Cave's *Lives*, which strongly supports this view of the matter. He speaks of Cletus *or* Anacletus; "for," he says, "the Greeks, and doubtless most truly, generally make him the same person."[k] This statement reduces the number of lists from three to two, inasmuch as the two Greeks, Irenæus and Epiphanius, differ in nothing but in using different names of the same person, or rather spelling the same name differently; the one being a mere contraction of the other, not more remarkable than occurs in every language. Thus we have Derick for Theodorick, Elmer for Ethelmer, Ralph for Rodolph, Reynaldus for Reginaldus, &c.

214. Tertullian has one passage which, possibly, Dr. Miller had in view in the quotation above. (§211.) He says, "Sicut Romanorum Clementem a Petro ordinatum edit:" "As the Church of the Romans tells of Clement ordained by Peter." The whole passage has been given in a previous Section. (§185.) Tertullian mentions the ordination of Clement by Peter as a circumstance stated, said, or asserted by the Church of the Romans: he does not state it on any special authority, much less does he say it on his own. On the contrary he says expressly, "Hac cathedra, Petrus qua sederat ipse, locatum Maxima Roma Linum, *primum* consedere jussit." "In this chair, in which Peter himself had sat, he commanded Linus, settled in Great Rome, *first* to sit."[l]

215. But why spend more time upon so insignificant an objection? Is not the statement to be relied on as to *the main fact*, that one was singled out and set over the Church to govern it?—Does not every one, even of Dr. Miller's witnesses, testify as to the fact that there was a succession of individual Bishops, *each in his day governing the Church*? Tertullian uses the strong language, "Evaristus ab hoc *rexit* sine crimine legem." Evaristus after him *ruled* (or *governed*) without reproach." The word *rexit* conveys the idea of *governing as a king*. Speaking of Hyginus who succeeded Telesphorus, he uses the word *magister*, a master, ruler, or chief.[m]

How insufficient, too, an objection that will apply to the list of one Church only, while the lists of the successive Bishops

---

k CAVE'S *Lives*, Vol. II. p. 189.

l TERTULLIANUS *adv. Marcion.* Lib. III. cap. ix.

m See passage last quoted.

Digitized by Google

of the Churches at Alexandria and Jerusalem, given by Eusebius from the time of the Apostles down, stand unaffected by it!

216. To argue that the statement, *universal in the Church*, that "in one city there could not be more than one Bishop,"[n] is not to be relied on, because there is a disagreement among the fathers, as to the name of one of the Bishops of the city of Rome,—is about as reasonable as to argue that the same city was not governed by a succession of Consuls, but that all the Senators had equal authority in the government, because there is some confusion in the lists which are handed down, of those who successively filled that high office. If there is some uncertainty respecting the exact order in which these succeeded one another, when there was every possible inducement to keep an exact account, and every aid that power could afford to have it done, how much greater might there be expected in the records of a people incessantly persecuted, whose leading men were continually slaughtered, insomuch that for three hundred years every Bishop, except perhaps one, suffered martyrdom, and whose Church books were continually sought after and destroyed? How miraculous would it be if there were not some confusion in some of the many lists that were kept of the Bishops of the different Churches!

217. The simple fact that such a list was kept in each Church, is positive evidence that there was a succession of persons, each of whom was, in his time, distinguished above all others. And how distinguished? By having the government on his shoulders. He was the Bishop, the Overseer of all, ruling all, and from whom all authority flowed. This is expressed sometimes very strongly. Thus, the Bishop was the *Governor*, *Magister*, *Antistes:* whose seat is called *cathedra*, *thronus*, &c. and who *governed*, *ruled*, (*rexit*,) &c. (§119, &c. §130, §153, &c. §191 to 203.)

218. Jerome is another writer whom Dr. Miller brings forward in support of his doctrine—"The testimony of Jerome," he says, "is remarkably explicit and decisive." He quotes two long passages to show this; one from his *Commentary on Titus*, the other from his *Epistle to Evagrius*.[o]

219. In the first, Jerome argues that a Presbyter was in the beginning the same as a Bishop. He says himself of what he has written, "These things I have written *to show*, that among the ancients, Presbyters and Bishops were the same."[p]

220. He says that at that time, "the Churches were governed by the common council of the Presbyters."[q]

221. That when parties were formed in the Church, "it was determined through the whole world, that one of the Presbyters

n JEROME in MILLER'S *Letters*, p. 182. [p. 119, 2d *ed*]
o *Ibid.* pp. 180, 183. [p. 118, 120, 2d *ed.*]
p *Ibid.* top of p. 183. [p. 119, 2d *ed.*] q *Ibid.* top of p. 181. [p. 118, 2d *ed.*]

Digitized by Google

should be set above the rest, to whom all care of the Church should belong, that the seeds of schism might be taken away."[r]

222. That this was done when "parties arose in the Church, and it was said among the people, *I am of Paul, I of Apollos, and I of Cephas*,"[s] &c.

223. And lastly he says, "As, therefore, the Presbyters know that by the custom of the Church, they are subject to him who is their President, so let Bishops know, that they are above Presbyters more by the custom of the Church than by the true dispensation of CHRIST; and that they ought to rule the Church in common, imitating Moses, who when he might alone rule the people of Israel, chose seventy with whom he might judge the people."[t]

224. To this it is replied, that, admitting, as stated in Sections 219, 220, and 221, that Bishops and Presbyters were, in the beginning, the same, governing the Churches in common council; and that it was in consequence of the formation of parties, that one Presbyter was set over the rest, *to which one, all care of the Church belonged*, to prevent divisions, ——— admitting, I say, this statement, and taking in connexion with it the date of the change which Jerome says was made in the government of the Church, the doctrine of the Episcopalians is completely upheld.

225. The date of the circumstance mentioned by Jerome[l] (§222) as having produced the change he speaks of, is easily determined. This circumstance is mentioned in Paul's first Epistle to the Corinthians,[u] which it has been shown, (§82) was written shortly before Paul left Ephesus.[v] He left that city above six years before the close of his history in the Acts; *viz.* one year before his arrest in Jerusalem, (§68, 3) which occurred five years before the close of his history above mentioned, (§61, 62.)

226. We have, moreover, an instance of one Presbyter being set over the rest, within one year of that very time spoken of by Paul and alluded to by Jerome, (§222.) Paul within this time (§68, 3,) set Timothy, who had been for three years one of his assistants in Ephesus, over the rest, giving him charge of the Church, (§11, &c.) and the reason given by Paul to Timothy for wishing him to take the charge, was the very one which Jerome alleges to have led to the change which he speaks of. Paul, knowing that some of the Presbyters of Ephesus would teach strange doctrines, after he left them, in order to draw away disciples after them,[w] besought Timothy to take charge of the Church in that city, that he might as far as possible restrain the evil.

227. In like manner and with similar powers he set Titus

---

r MILLER'S *Letters*, top of p. 181. [p. 118, 2d *ed.*]
s *Ibid.* bottom of p. 180. [p. 118, 2d *ed.*]
t *Ibid.* p. 183. [p. 119, 2d *ed.*]
u 1 Cor. i. 12.
v 1 Cor. xvi. 8.
w Acts xx. 30.

Digitized by Google

over the Cretans; and other Apostles did the same in other places, (§130.)

228. This was therefore done by the Apostles themselves; and because done by inspired men, it is a *divine institution.* If the institutions of men inspired by GOD are not *divine* institutions, then there are none such; GOD having instituted nothing but through the medium of inspired men. Being therefore divine, *this* is obligatory on all. This obligation Dr. Miller himself asserts. He says, "If all the interests of the Church are precious in the view of every enlightened Christian, it is evident that *the mode of its organization* cannot be a trivial concern; and if the SAVIOUR, or *those who were immediately taught by his* SPIRIT, *have* laid down any rules, or *given us any information on this subject, it behoves us* carefully to study what they have delivered, and *to make it our constant guide.*"[x]

229. This setting one above the Presbyters to restrain and govern them (§226) was done, moreover, by that Apostle who was called in a more remarkable manner than any other; viz. by JESUS CHRIST in person, after his ascent to heaven, and by Him specially sent to open the eyes of the Gentiles. It was done in that Church with which he remained a longer time than with any other; towards which he showed extraordinary care, witnessed by his most affectionate Epistle, containing the fullest and most particular advice to all manner of persons. It was done in the fullest and most open manner, all authority in that Church being made to depend on Timothy's consent.

230. This custom, then, that one person should be set over the Church to govern it, in order to prevent divisions; which Jerome says was determined through the whole world, and therefore by all the Apostles; (§130, 185;) originated with these inspired Servants of GOD; and is, therefore, a *divine* institution, and absolutely binding on all the Church. And to use Dr. Miller's words, '*it behoves us to make it our constant guide.*'

231. *The custom of the Church*, guides us in deciding the question whether children are to be baptized. We appeal to *the custom of the Church*, to decide the question as to *the mode of Baptism*, the word itself signifying to wet either by affusion or immersion. *The custom of the Church* is eagerly sought after by the disputants on either side of these questions, and relied on confidently, *as indicating the mind of* GOD *on the subject.* But who will undertake to produce as clear, as decisive, and as numerous instances of *the custom of the Church*, in relation to either the subject, or the mode of Baptism, as have already been produced, in these few pages, *in relation to its government?* Who will undertake to produce *a solitary instance* of the Apostles themselves actually baptizing an infant? or *a solitary instance* in which it is *clearly expressed* that they either

x MILLER's *Letters*, p. 6. [p. 3, 2d *ed.*] the first words in italics in this passage, are so printed in the book itself.

Digitized by Google

sprinkled or immersed the person baptized? And who will deny that they actually set one over the Church to govern it? or that they subjected the Presbyters to that one?

232. It has now been shown that this passage from Jerome, taken as it is offered, does not support the doctrine in behalf of which it is advanced; but that it plainly declares that episcopacy was established through the whole world, by a decree—*decretum est*—after parties were formed in the Church and it was said among the people, *I am of Paul, I of Apollos, and I of Cephas*, &c. (§222) which was in the time of Paul and other Apostles, (§225) and consequently was done by them, and is therefore a *divine* institution; inasmuch as they were inspired of GOD, and were his immediate agents in the establishment of the order of the Church, (§228.)

233. After noticing the bearing of this passage, without objecting to its being offered as testimony on the subject before us, let us look a little into its claim to be considered in that light.

234. Dr. Miller commences his examination of the testimony of the fathers with a refusal to receive any but those of the *first two centuries*. His words are, "In examining the writings of the fathers, I shall admit only the testimony of those who wrote within the FIRST TWO CENTURIES.[y]" After this round protest, he produces, besides others who lived after the second century, Jerome who wrote near *the end of the fourth*, as affording decisive testimony in the controversy.

235. Dr. Miller objects to receiving the testimony of the fathers who lived after the second century, because of the corruptions that began to creep into the Church after this period; Papacy beginning to exhibit its pretensions, &c. so "that the testimony of every subsequent writer is to be received with suspicion."[z] And yet he brings forward Jerome, who has, in the Epistle to Evagrius quoted by Dr. Miller as decisive testimony in his favour, the following words: "Who can endure it that a minister of tables and widows should proudly exalt himself above those (Presbyters) *at whose prayers the body and blood of* CHRIST *is made?*"[a]

236. Dr. Miller, moreover, objects at length to receiving any thing from the fathers but facts. He says, "We protest, therefore, utterly against any appeal to them as an authority on this subject."——"Waving, therefore, all further discussion of their title to credit, I will cheerfully admit them as credible witnesses with respect to matters of *fact*, which might be supposed to come within their knowledge."[b]

237. And yet after this plain declaration, that which he brings forward from Jerome, consists almost entirely of *an argument*

---

y MILLER'S *Letters*, p. 126, [p. 81, 2d *ed.*] the three words in small capitals are so printed in that book.

z *Ibid.* p. 126, [p. 81, 2d *ed.*]

a See MILLER'S *Letters*, p. 184, [p. 120, 2d *ed.*]

b *Ibid.* p. 125, [p. 81, 2d *ed.*] The word *fact* is in italics in the book.

Digitized by Google

to maintain what Jerome himself calls *his opinion*:[c] and even of the statements as to matters of *fact*, there is one only which can be admitted according to the rule laid down by Dr. Miller, (§236:) which is the statement made in these words; "And certainly, in one city there could not be more than one Bishop, as they are *now* styled."[d] Every other statement relates to what passed some hundred years before Jerome's day, (See §220, 221, 222.)

238. Dr. Miller is particularly unfortunate in the production of this passage from Jerome, inasmuch as it contains testimony in favour of the primitive institution of episcopacy exactly of the kind he requires. He says, "They [Episcopalians] must produce from those venerable remains of antiquity, passages which prove, either by direct assertion, or fair inference, 1) that the *Bishops* of the primitive Church were a *distinct order* of clergy from those *Presbyters* who were authorized to preach and administer sacraments, and superior to them; 2) that these *Bishops*, when they were advanced to this superior office, had a new and distinct *ordination*; 3) that each Bishop had under him a number of congregations, with their Pastors, whom he governed; 4) that these Bishops were exclusively invested with the right of *ordaining*, and administering the rite of *confirmation*; and 5) that this kind of episcopacy was considered by *the whole* primitive Church, as an institution of JESUS CHRIST. When any *one* of these facts is fairly proved, from early antiquity, the friends of presbyterian church government will feel as if they had something like solid argument to contend with; but not till then."[e]

239. In the passage quoted by Dr. Miller, the express statement of Jerome establishes the first, third, and fifth of the particulars which the former requires to be proved. Jerome's words are according to Dr. Miller,[f] "It was determined through the whole world, that one of the Presbyters should be set above the rest, to whom all care of the Church should belong, that the seeds of schism might be taken away."

240. The first particular required to be proved, (that the Bishops were a distinct order from the Presbyters, and superior to them, §238) is established by the words, *that one of the Presbyters should be set above the rest, to whom* ALL CARE OF THE CHURCH SHOULD BELONG, (§239.) Being set above the rest, with all the care of the Church belonging to him, he was *superior to the rest*. And this being done *through the whole world*, those who are thus chosen from among the Presbyters and set above the rest, *with all the care of the Church on them*, were surely a distinct order.

---

c *Ibid.* p. 181, [p. 119, 2d *ed.*]

d *Ibid.* p. 182, [p. 118, 2d *ed.*] the word *now* is in italics in the book.

e *Ibid.* p. 127, [p. 82, 2d *ed.*] the words in italics are so in the book; the figures which mark the different members of this quotation are not: they are placed there for the convenience of reference.

f *Letters*, p. 181, [p. 118, 2d *ed.*]

Digitized by Google

241. The third particular, (that each Bishop had under him a number of congregations, with their Pastors, whom he governed, (§238,) is established by the words, "*that he should be set above the rest*," *viz.* of the Presbyters, (§239.) Why was he set over them? Because "every one began to consider those whom he baptized rather his than CHRIST'S." What were the means by which this evil was to be remedied? *Giving him all care of the Church, that the seeds of schism* (or *division*) *might be taken away*, (§239.)

The subordination of the Presbyters to the Bishop is strongly manifested by the letter of the Presbyters and Deacons of Rome to Cyprian, when they wrote, as usual on such occasions, to inform him of the death of Fabian, Bishop of the Church in that city. Speaking of the dissensions that had arisen respecting the receiving of such as had fallen away in time of persecution, on their profession of repentance, they say, "That *they must of necessity* defer to deal in that cause till GOD did send them a new Bishop which might moderate (that is, regulate) all things."[g]

242. As to the number of pastors and congregations under each Bishop, (§241,) that depended upon the population of the city and its neighbourhood. In Carthage we know there were at least eight Churches, (buildings) and at least as many Presbyters under Cyprian, Bishop of the Church in that city, (§195.) Cornelius, Bishop of Rome, about the same time, in a long account to Fabius, Bishop of Antioch, of the attempt of Novatus to obtain the bishopric of the Church in the former city, mentions incidentally that there were in that Church forty-six Presbyters, seven Deacons, some inferior officers, more than fifteen hundred widows and afflicted persons, and members innumerable.[h]

243. The fifth particular, (that this kind of episcopacy was considered by the whole primitive Church, as an institution of JESUS CHRIST, §238,) is established by the words, "*it was determined through the whole world*," (§239,) that one chosen out of the Presbyters should be set above the rest, to whom all care of the Church should belong.

It was not decreed by any general council of the Church. It was determined by the Apostles before any such council was called. Irenæus and Tertullian say they could enumerate the successive Bishops in the different Churches, from those who were appointed by the Apostles themselves down to their time, (130, 185.) And from Ignatius, who lived and communicated with the Apostles themselves, we learn that in his time the three orders of Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons, were as completely a part of the organization of the Church, and as intimately connected with its existence, as baptizing and administering the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. It could therefore only have

g HOOKER, Vol. II. p. 259.
h EUSEBIUS, *Ecclesiast. Hist.* Book VI. Chap. xliii. See the note to Section 209.

Digitized by Google

been decreed by the Apostles, no other men having the power to do it, or the influence to cause it to be universally received.

Moreover, that episcopacy was established by them, appears very plainly, not only from Jerome's declaration, that *it was when it was said among the people, I am of Paul, I of Apollos, and I of Cephas*, which was in the time of the Apostles; but also from the fact that Jerome himself says, that James, Mark, Titus, and Timothy were made Bishops by the Apostles;[i] which declaration of Jerome respecting the two last mentioned, is plainly confirmed by the Epistles of Paul to Timothy and Titus; from which it is evident that Timothy particularly, was set over the Presbyters with whom he had been for three years acting under Paul's superintendence in Ephesus, to prevent them from preaching false doctrine and drawing away disciples after them.[k]

244. Episcopacy, therefore, was manifestly instituted by the Apostles, and one of the clearest marked cases of the appointment of one person to rule the Presbyters and take charge of the Church generally, is by that Apostle to whom our LORD JESUS CHRIST personally appeared, after his ascent to heaven, to commission him to go to the Gentiles and enlighten them. From him, therefore, who was so well known by all the Churches to be most careful of the order and doctrine of the Church, and who declared, *I certify you, brethren, that the Gospel which was preached of me is not after man. For I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of* JESUS CHRIST:—from him receiving it, they could but receive it as an institution of JESUS CHRIST.

245. The first part of the fourth particular, (that these Bishops were exclusively invested with the right of ordaining,) flows from the first and third, (§238.) For, the Presbyters being subject to the Bishop, and *all the care* of the Church belonging to the latter, how could the former have power to give the Bishop assistants he might not like; or to the Church, ministers whom he might think unworthy? The very idea is absurd, that *he* should have *the care*, and *they*, the *appointment* of ministers. It would be to destroy the very object of instituting Bishops. Instead of all care of the Church belonging to the Bishop, it would be divided with the Presbyters in one of the most important points; and this would enable Presbyters who were opposed to the Bishop, to multiply partizans, and would most effectually promote schism.

246. It is not, however, left to inference alone. It is plainly asserted by those who lived long before Jerome; of which see an instance in Section 191. And Jerome himself has a passage connected immediately with the Epistle to Evagrius, which is quoted by Dr. Bowden, but not by Dr. Miller. The words are, "For what does a Bishop, which a Presbyter may not do, *ex-*

---

i TAYLOR'S *Works*, Vol. VII. p. 91. k 1 Tim. i. 3; Acts xx. 30.

Digitized by Google

cepting ordination?"[l] This passage shows plainly that the Presbyters had not the power of ordaining; but that this belonged exclusively to the Bishop.

247. The second part of the fourth particular, (that the Bishops had, exclusively, the right of confirmation, §238,) is shown by another passage from Jerome. He says, "It is the custom of the Church, for Bishops to go and invoke the HOLY SPIRIT, by imposition of hands, *on such as were baptized by Presbyters and Deacons*, in villages and places remote from the mother Church.' 'Do you ask,' says he, 'where this is written? In the Acts of the Apostles'—referring to Acts viii. and xix."[m]

248. In the first of these cases, Philip the Deacon went down to Samaria, in consequence of the persecution in Jerusalem, and preached the Gospel and baptized the converts both men and women.[n] And when the Apostles at Jerusalem heard of this, they sent thither Peter and John, *who laid their hands on them, and they received the* HOLY GHOST. The Deacon preached and baptized, but no more; the Apostles confirmed the converts. So Philip afterwards (same chapter) preached to the Eunuch, and baptized him, but no more.

249. In the second case, (§247) some disciples at Ephesus, who had only been baptized *unto John's baptism*, were convinced by Paul of the necessity of being baptized in the name of CHRIST, and were baptized in the name of the LORD JESUS; and then Paul laid his hands on them, and they received the HOLY GHOST.[o] This case Jerome refers to, as an instance of confirmation. Observe, it is not said that *he* baptized them. This was often, if not generally left to others: thus Paul says, *I thank* GOD *that I baptized none of you but Crispus and Gaius ——and I baptized also the household of Stephanus: besides I know not whether I baptized any other. For* CHRIST *sent me not to baptize, but to preach the Gospel.*[p] And Peter, in like manner, after seeing that the HOLY SPIRIT had fallen on Cornelius and his company, *commanded them to be baptized.*[q]

250. This, by the way, shows very plainly what relation the Bishops sustained towards the Presbyters and Deacons, in Jerome's estimation. He says, it is the custom of the Church for the Bishops to go and confirm those whom the Presbyters and Deacons had baptized. And anticipating the question, 'Where is this written?' he refers to two passages in which Apostles had done this very thing. Therefore, with Jerome, Apostles and Bishops were the same.

251. The second particular, (that these *Bishops*, when they were advanced to this superior office, had a new and distinct ordination, §238,) cannot be proved from this passage from Jerome: but the following is sufficient; part of it from him, and part from authority of a much earlier date.

---

l BOWDEN'S *Letters*, Vol. I. p 20. [Vol. I. p. 11, 2d *ed.*]
m BOWDEN'S *Letters*, Vol. I. p. 8. [p. 5, 2d *ed.*]
n Acts viii. 12.
o Acts xix. 1—6.
p 1 Corinth. i. 14, 16, 17.
q Acts x. 48.

Digitized by Google

252. Cyprian was a Presbyter of Carthage, and was afterwards ordained Bishop, according to his own Deacon and intimate friend Pontius, and to Eusebius and Jerome.[r] "Cyprian tells us that Cornelius had advanced, gradually, through all the inferior stations," and, consequently, had been a Presbyter before he was a Bishop. Yet we find, when he was promoted to the see of Rome, he was ordained by sixteen Bishops.[s] Fortunatus, one of the five Presbyters who joined with Felicissimus against Cyprian, set himself up as Bishop at Carthage, and was ordained by five false Bishops.[t] Cornelius, Bishop of Rome, in a letter to Fabius, Bishop of Antioch, respecting the troubles excited by Novatus, a Pesbyter, states that he having been disappointed in his hopes of being elected Bishop, determined nevertheless to be Bishop of his party, and sent two persons to an obscure part of Italy, and induced three Bishops, from the country, and very simple men, by a false pretence to go to Rome, and there forced them to lay hands on him, and ordain him Bishop.[u] It is evident from this last statement, that it was so universally known that a Presbyter must be ordained to the office of Bishop, that without it Novatus could not hope to succeed in his schemes.

253. It appears, therefore, that the first, third, fifth, and fourth points Dr. Miller requires to be proved by the advocates of episcopal government, (§238,) are established by one of the passages he has quoted from Jerome, (§238 to 249) and the second, and only remaining one, by passages from him and others of higher authority, because living near a century and a half earlier, (§252.)

254. The second quotation from Jerome, before alluded to, (§218,) will now be briefly examined. In this passage the same argument is used to show that Presbyters and Bishops were in the commencement the same; the same declaration made, that one of the Presbyters was set over the rest to take charge of the Church; and the same reason given, *to prevent schism, or division of the Church.*

255. Jerome goes on, in the sentence immediately following that in which this is stated, to say, "For at Alexandria, from Mark the Evangelist, to Heraclas and Dionysius, the Bishops thereof, the Presbyters always named one, chosen from among them, and placed in a higher degree, *Bishop.* As if an army should make an Emperor; or the Deacons should choose one of themselves, whom they know to be most diligent, and call him Archdeacon."[v]

256. On this Dr. Miller remarks,[w] "Jerome further informs us, that the first pre-eminence of Bishops was only such as the body of the Presbyters were able to confer. They were only stand-

r BOWDEN'S *Letters*, Vol I. p. 96. [Vol. I. p. 48, 2d *ed.*]

s CYPRIAN'S *Epistles*, 55, 56, quoted by Dr. BOWDEN, *Letters*, Vol. I. p. 96. [Vol. I. p. 48, 2d *ed.*] t BOWDEN, Vol. I. p. 97, [p. 38, 2d *ed.*] from Sage.

u EUSEBIUS, *Eccles. Hist.* Book VI. chap. xliii.

v MILLER'S *Letters* ,p. 185. [p. 121, 2d *ed.*] w Page 187. [p. 122, 2d *ed.*]

Digitized by Google

ing presidents or moderators; and all the ordination they received on being thus chosen, was performed *by the Presbyters themselves.*" But the reader may observe, there is nothing in the passage from Jerome (§255,) to support this round assertion of Dr. Miller's, but the declaration that the Presbyters *named one chosen among themselves, and placed in an higher degree, Bishop*, until the time of Heraclas and Dionysius. There is not one word said about *ordaining*, and, according to Dr. Bowden, what is said about it, is in the next sentence to that which closes Dr. Miller's quotation; and runs thus: "For what does a Bishop, which a Presbyter may not do, *excepting ordination?*"[x] It is manifest, therefore, that the Presbyters of the Church at Alexandria *named or elected the Bishop; but Bishops ordained him.*

257. That Jerome did not intend what Dr. Miller represents as his opinion, is evident, moreover, from the following sentence in the Epistle to Evagrius, and from its being mentioned by both Drs. Miller and Bowden in the singular number, it is to be presumed there is but one, and consequently the passage is a part of the same that Dr. Miller quotes. Jerome in this Epistle says, "That we may know that *the apostolic traditions* were taken from the Old Testament, that which Aaron and his sons, and the Levites, were in the temple, let the Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons claim to themselves in the Church."[y]

In this passage it is most manifest that Jerome, as represented above (§225, 243) makes the institution of episcopacy rest upon the Apostles, and represents it as being derived from the Jewish Church, which surely was a divine institution, and transferred to the Christian Church, in which the Bishop, it is said, claims in his Church the superior station of the High Priest among the Jews; the Presbyters that of his Sons; and the Deacons that of the Levites.

258. It has been shown that Jerome could not have meant what Dr. Miller attributes to him, because it is utterly inconsistent with passages in this very Epistle to Evagrius, (§256, 257,) as well as with other passages from his works, (§154, 250.) We shall find by attending to the practice of the other Churches in the time of Heraclas and Dionysius, that it is impossible that they could have been ordained by Presbyters. Dionysius succeeded Heraclas in the year 248, about the time that Cornelius succeeded to the bishopric of Rome, and Cyprian to that of Carthage. The two latter were ordained by Bishops, (§252: see also §191, 194, 200, 203;) and it is certain from the letters of Cyprian and Cornelius, that it was the ancient established order of the Church, (§153, 194.) It is impossible to reconcile the practice indicated in these statements with the belief that *Presbyters ordained the Bishop* after he was elected. The conduct of Novatus, a Presbyter of Rome, is equally irreconcilea-

x BOWDEN'S *Letters*, Vol. I. p. 20. [Vol. I. p. 11, 2d *ed.*] See also HOOKER, Vol. II. p. 261 for the same passage from Jerome.

y MILLER'S *Reply*, p. 179. [p. 330, 2d *ed.*]

Digitized by Google

ble with this doctrine. No man can soberly believe that he would have committed such an outrage as that related of him, (§252,) which eventually destroyed him, if he had not very well known that the imposition of the hands of Bishops was indispensable to his pretensions to the bishopric. Neither can it be believed, that the mode of ordination was different, in this particular, in the Church at Alexandria from that of other Churches; because there was a constant intercourse kept up between the different Churches, and particularly between the Churches of Rome, Alexandria, and Carthage. Such an essential difference could not possibly have passed unnoticed in the numerous Epistles of Cyprian and others; particularly when we consider what care was taken to preserve uniformity throughout the Church; how very important they justly considered uniformity of order, doctrine, and practice; (§130, 185;) and what a stir was produced by a difference about the time of celebrating Easter. Finally, Blondel admits that episcopacy was established in Alexandria above a century before this, (§162.)

259. It must not be passed unnoticed, that Dr. Miller endeavours to prove in his remarks on this passage, that Presbyters *ordained* the Bishop when he was elected; and in addition to what he states from Jerome, quotes Eutychius to prove it, in the following passage. "Besides, Eutychius, the Patriarch of Alexandria, in his *Origines Ecclesiæ Alexandrinæ*, published by the learned Selden, expressly declares, 'that the twelve Presbyters constituted by Mark, upon the vacancy of the see, did choose out of their number one to be head over the rest, and the other eleven did lay their hands upon him, and blessed him, and made him Patriarch.'"[z]

260. If Dr. Miller could succeed in this attempt, he would at least prove that a *second* ordination was necessary, to raise the elected Presbyter to this office; and this proves the superiority. A man is set apart by ordination to the office of a Presbyter; after a time a Presbyter is set apart by ordination to the office of Bishop. If the Presbyter, by virtue of that ordination, becomes one of an order distinct from the mass of the members of the Church, the Bishop becomes, by virtue of the second ordination, one of an order distinct from the mass of Presbyters.

261. What, moreover, is the testimony on which this is built? —Eutychius lived in the *tenth* century. The very production of such an evidence by one who sets out with protesting that he will not admit the testimony of any one, upon this subject, who lived after the second century, is proof strong enough that no better is to be had. And even those who lived in the second century, were to be allowed to testify respecting those things only, that might be supposed to have come within *their own* knowledge. But here is a man from the *tenth* century brought forward to testify of facts in the *first*. On whose authority does

z MILLER'S *Letters*, p. 188, note. [p. 123, 2d *ed.*]

Digitized by Google

he make these statements? We are left to suppose, from Dr. Miller's silence on the subject, that this *express declaration* of Eutychius is supported by no authority, the production of which would avail the cause. It certainly is not from Ignatius, Irenæus, Tertullian, Origen, Epiphanius, Jerome—although the latter speaks particularly on the subject, (§255, &c.)

262. It is evident, therefore, that Eutychius' testimony would be utterly insignificant, even though he were an approved writer. But this character cannot be claimed for him. Dr. Bowden shows by reference to Pearson's *Vindiciæ*, and to Eusebius's *Ecclesiastical History*, that this author is very incorrect in many particulars, and inconsistent with himself. He is grossly incorrect with regard to his statements even respecting Origen, a Presbyter of Alexandria, one of the most remarkable men in the ancient Church. He calls him a Bishop, which he never was, and says he was excommunicated by the Bishop of Constantinople, to which city he was sent for by Justinian; when Origen did not live in the same century with Justinian, but at least three hundred years before him; and was excommunicated by the Bishop of Alexandria. It is not however necessary to go beyond the extract itself, to show the looseness of this writer. The title *Patriarch* was not used in the Church till long after the time he speaks of.

It may again be remarked, also, that the word *Presbyter* is sometimes used in a general sense. A Bishop is a Presbyter, though every Presbyter is not a Bishop, (§147;) as the High Priest among the Jews was often included in the expression, *the Priests and Levites*.

It may perhaps be worth mentioning that Simeon Metaphrastes, who lived in the same century with Eutychius, says, that St. Mark "ordained as his successor, Anianus, Bishop of Alexandria, and gave to other Churches, Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons."[a]

263. It must not be forgotten that Dr. Miller, in his attempt to prove that the second ordination was performed by Presbyters, has been driven *to admit a second ordination;* which alone is destructive of his whole doctrine. A second ordination to what? To a superior order necessarily. Certainly not to an inferior station—surely not to the same he then occupied—necessarily, therefore, to a superior.

264. Dr. Miller closes his observations on this subject in the following manner; "It is finally manifest, from these quotations, that while Jerome maintains the parity of all ministers of the Gospel in the primitive Church, he entirely excludes *Deacons* from being an order of *clergy*, at all—'Who can endure it that a *minister of tables and of widows* should proudly exalt

---

[a] BOWDEN'S *Letters*, Vol. I. p. 22, [Vol. I. p. 12, 2d *ed.*] who refers to Book II. Chap. xliii.

Digitized by Google

himself above those at whose prayers the body and blood of CHRIST is made?'"

265. This is another singular specimen of testimony from Jerome. Giving way to an improper warmth against the folly of the person of whom he was writing, he opprobriously calls him '*a minister of tables and of widows.*' This is, however, very far from showing that even Jerome himself designed to convey the idea, that Deacons were not an order of ministers. It is not credible that he had such a thought, when he states the reverse in this very letter to Evagrius, (§257,) and in the plainest manner declares, that from the commencement of the preaching of the Gospel, they and the Presbyters administered baptism to the new converts, (§247, to 250.) That Deacons did preach and baptize in the days of the Apostles, is as certain as that Paul did.[b]

266. Jerome was apt to express himself warmly, and on some occasions he spoke very freely of the Bishops, but yet in such terms as show their superiority as perfectly as if he had expressly stated it. Thus he says in one place of proud Bishops, "As if placed upon some lofty eminence, they scarce deign to see mortals and to speak to their fellow servants." Again, "the accusation of a Bishop is difficult. For if he shall have sinned, it is not believed; and if he shall have been convicted, he is not punished." And again, "It is a very bad custom in some Churches, that the Presbyters are silent and do not speak while the Bishops are present, as if they were disliked or were not thought worthy to hear."

Neither does he spare the Presbyters when they acted improperly, though he was himself one of this order. Speaking of Vigilantius, a Presbyter, who propagated false doctrines, he says, "I marvel that the holy Bishop, under whom Vigilantius is said to be a Presbyter, doth yield to his fury, and not break that unprofitable vessel with his *apostolic* and iron rod."[c]

267. There is one representation of Dr. Miller respecting the time of the institution of episcopacy, which must not pass unnoticed. He says, "From the foregoing extracts (from Jerome) it is abundantly apparent,——that a *departure* from the *primitive model* of church government had taken place in *Jerome's* day;" &c.[d] Also, that "it is expressly asserted by Jerome, that this change in the constitution of the Christian ministry came in (*paulatim*) *by little and little.*"—"But whether half a century or two centuries elapsed before the whole world came to an agreement on this subject, he does not say."[e]

268. This surely is very little like what Jerome says. *His words are*, according to Dr. MILLER, p. 180,[f] "Before there

b See Acts vi. 9, 10; viii. 5, 12, 35, 40. c HOOKER, Vol. II. p. 262.

d MILLER's *Letters*, p. 186, 187. [p. 122, 2d *ed.*] Italics as printed in the book.

e MILLER's *Letters*, p. 187. [p. 122, 2d *ed.*] f [p. 118, 2d *ed.*]

Digitized by Google

were by the devil's instinct; parties in religion, and it was said among the people, *I am of Paul, I of Apollos, and I of Cephas*, the Churches were governed by the common council of the Presbyters. But *afterwards*, when every one thought that those whom he baptized were rather his than CHRIST's, it was determined through the whole world, that one of the Presbyters should be set above the rest," &c.

The date of the circumstance here alluded to is known: it occurred at Corinth in the time of Paul. Before that time, Jerome says, the Church was governed by the common council of the Presbyters—consequently after that time it was not. By whom, then, was it governed after that time? By the Bishops; to whom, it was determined throughout the world, that the care of the Church should belong, to restrain the ambition of those Presbyters who might be desirous of drawing away disciples after them.[g]

269. Dr. Miller's *translation* is calculated to support the same idea, that a long time elapsed before Bishops were set over the Churches. He represents Jerome as saying, "But *afterwards*, when every one," &c. (§268) with 'afterwards' *in italics* in his book. Jerome's words, according to Jeremy Taylor are, "Postquam unusquisque,"[h] &c. *Postquam* does not signify '*afterwards when*.' This passage from an ancient author, "*Postquam* aspexi, illico cognovi," is given by Ainsworth as an illustration of the meaning of this word. Ainsworth's English to *postquam* in this sentence is, *after that*; and the passage in English stands thus, '*After that* I saw you, I immediately knew you.'—In this it is evident that the word, *illico—immediately*, shows that *postquam* does not necessarily signify *some time after*—but may mean the very moment after. Accordingly among us an expression corresponding with that given above would be, '*the moment* I saw you, I knew you.'

Ainsworth gives another illustration of the meaning of this word. "*Postquam* natus sum, satur nunquam fui." His English for *postquam* in this case, is '*since*;' and the passage translated stands thus, "*Since* I was born, I have never been full fed." In this passage also, the word, *nunquam—never*, shows that *postquam—since*, is limited to the very instant after. The literal meaning of *postquam* conveys the same idea: it is compounded of *post* and *quam*, '*after*' '*which*.' *Postea* is the word Jerome would have used if he had meant what Dr. Miller attributes to him. *Postea* signifies *afterwards*, indefinitely: *Postquam*—'since,' 'after that,' literally 'after which,' referring you to the time when a thing was done, as in both the illustrations given above from Ainsworth; and as in this very case from Jerome. '*Before* that time the common council of Presbyters,' he says, 'governed the Church: *after* that, the Bishops.' But according to Dr. Miller, Jerome does not say whether one or

g Acts xx. 30.

h TAYLOR's *Works*, Vol. VII. p. 91.

Digitized by Google

two centuries elapsed before the whole world came to an agreement on this subject. Jerome does not say any thing about an agreement—but, it was determined or *decreed*—'decretum est,' —(§221, 230.) He moreover does say that James, Mark, Timothy, and Titus, were made Bishops by the Apostles, (§243) and shows that the Apostles themselves were Bishops, exercising powers which Presbyters and Deacons did not, (§247.)

270. Dr. Miller is not more correct in stating Jerome's views of the manner in which the ambition of ministers led to the change he speaks of. Dr. Miller says, "And finally, he (Jerome) asserts that this *departure* from the *primitive model*, owed its origin to the decay of religion, and especially to the ambition of ministers. It commenced 'When every one began to think those whom he baptized were rather *his* than CHRIST's."[i]

271. In this passage episcopacy is represented as *the effect* of the ambition of ministers who began to think those whom they baptized were their own: 'it owed its origin to the decay of religion, and *especially* to the ambition of ministers:' whereas Jerome represents it as instituted, *because* they began to evince these ambitious views, *in order that* the seeds of schism or division might be taken away.[k] And this is perfectly consistent with common sense. These ambitious views must necessarily lead to divisions, by each attempting to draw away disciples after him, as Paul says, Acts xx. 30; and the very intention of the Apostles in setting one above the rest, as their *Overseer* or Bishop, was to restrain this evil; as Paul, having in view this very thing,[l] told Timothy, when setting him over the Presbyters of Ephesus.[m] It was ambition, then, which would have led the Presbyters, each to set up for himself and exercise separate authority over such portion of the flock as he could induce to become his partizans. It was to control this ambition, that the Apostles set one above the Presbyters. It was ambition which would have led to the establishment of a church government of Presbyters. It was submission to the authority of the Apostles which led to the establishment of episcopacy.

272. With regard to the opinion expressed in the closing sentence of Dr. Miller's extract from Jerome, (§223,) it may be observed:

First, it is but an opinion; what the writer thought ought to be.

Secondly, it is the opinion of a man who wrote late in the *fourth* century, which Dr. Miller has on two accounts protested against receiving, (§234 to 236.)

Thirdly, it ought not to be believed, without clear evidence, that Jerome intended to advise that the Church should be governed, as he says it was in the beginning, by a common

---

i MILLER'S *Reply*, p. 177, [p. 329, 2d *ed.*]
k MILLER'S *Letters*, p. 181, [p. 119, 2d *ed.*]
l Acts xx. 30.
m 1 Tim. i. 3.

Digitized by Google

council of Presbyters; when he declares that that mode of government was done away at the time of the disturbances in Corinth, (221, 222,) because it was found to lead to divisions, through the ambition of those who were making partizans for themselves instead of members of CHRIST. It ought not to be believed, without clear evidence, that he meant to advise that the episcopal form of government, which he shows was established by the Apostles, (§221, 222, 225 to 230, 243,) should be done away. But, so far from there being any evidence of such an opinion, the very words in which he expresses his sentiments on this subject, show that he had no such idea. For, he advises such a mode of government as Moses established, which would have been very little like the presbyterian form of government. The form which Moses established is stated in full in Exodus xviii. 13 to 26. In the 25th and 26th verses it is said, *And Moses chose able men out of all Israel, and made them heads over the people, rulers of thousands, rulers of hundreds, rulers of fifties, and rulers of tens. And they judged the people at all seasons:* THE HARD CAUSES THEY BROUGHT UNTO MOSES, BUT EVERY SMALL MATTER THEY JUDGED THEMSELVES. Here Moses reserved a controlling power, the seventy exercised a subordinate rule; a form of government as little like the presbyterian, and as much like the episcopal, as one thing can be like another: to approach nearer the latter, it must be identified with it.

Fourthly, It must be remarked that this was not the plan GOD instituted for Moses. He set him over the people alone. But Moses' father-in-law, paying him a visit, and observing what labour he went through in the government of the people, advised him to this plan;[n] and when Moses besought GOD to give him help to rule the people, GOD appointed the seventy whom Moses chose out of Israel, but showed marked displeasure at the request,[o] and, as it were, to show Moses that his grace would have sufficed to support him under any load that he might have put upon him, he told Moses that he would take of the Spirit that was in him and give it to them;[p] plainly intimating that the Spirit which was in him was sufficient to have enabled him to perform the service required of him.

273. It is evident from the preceding examination of the passages from Jerome quoted by Dr. Miller, that he fully supports the doctrine that episcopacy was established by the Apostles. It is however to be remarked that he is certainly wrong in saying, that, even before the divisions at Corinth, the Church was governed by a common council of Presbyters, except in subordination to the authority of the Apostles. This, it is to be remembered, is not a matter that could possibly have come under his own notice. He lived three hundred years after the apostolic age. His judgment must, therefore, to be correct, be founded

n Exodus xviii. 13, &c. o Numbers xi. 10, &c. p Numbers xi. 17.

Digitized by Google

on testimony. What testimony is there that the Presbyters in common council governed the Church? None. But there is abundant evidence of the reverse. Paul had the care of all the Churches which he planted, as himself not only says;[q] but as he evinces on many occasions by the authority he claimed and exercised over them.

274. To the Corinthians Paul wrote thus, *But I will come to you shortly, if the* LORD *will; and will know, not the speech of them which are puffed up, but the power.—What will ye? Shall I come unto you* WITH A ROD, *or in love, and in the spirit of meekness?*[r] In the eleventh chapter, after giving various directions, he says, *And the rest I will set in order when I come.*[s]—*Now concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given order to the Churches of Galatia, even so do ye.*[t]—*For I fear, lest, when I come, I shall not find you such as I would, and that I shall be found unto you such as ye would not.*[u]—*I told you before, and foretel you, as if I were present the second time; and being absent, now I write to them which heretofore have sinned, and to all others, that, if I come again, I will not spare.*[v]—*Therefore I write these things being absent, lest being present, I should use sharpness, according to the power which the* LORD *hath given me to edification and not to destruction.*[w]—*For ye know what commandments we gave you by the* LORD JESUS[x]—*Wherefore, though I might be much bold in* CHRIST *to enjoin thee that which is convenient,* &c.[y] On one occasion he uses this strong language, *For I verily, as absent in body, but present in spirit, have judged already, as though I were present,* CONCERNING *him that hath so done this deed; &c. to deliver such an one unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the* LORD JESUS.[z] In this passage the word *concerning* is supplied by the translator, and not to be found in the original, as is intimated by its being printed in italics. By leaving it out, the meaning of the original is better expressed. *I have already judged,* (*or condemned*, or passed sentence upon,) him that hath done this deed," &c.[a]

275. These passages show most unequivocally that the Apostles exercised a positive control in the affairs of the Church; and although the Presbyters had a subordinate rule, particularly in the absence of the Apostles, it is manifest from the directions of Paul to Timothy and Titus with respect to them, that he did not hesitate to exercise authority over them whenever he found it necessary. It is moreover evident from the directions given to Timothy and Titus, that the Presbyters and Deacons were entirely under their control. The Presbyters of Ephesus are

---

q 2 Corinth. xi. 28.
r 1 Cor. iv. 19, 21.
s 1 Cor. xi. 34.
t 1 Cor. xvi. 1.
u 2 Cor. xii. 20.
v 2 Cor. xiii. 2.
w 2 Cor. xiii. 10.
x 1 Thess. iv. 2.
y Philem. 8.
z 1 Cor. v. 3, 5.
a See also 2 Thess. iii. 6 to 14; Acts xvi. 4; xx. 28—31.

Digitized by Google

indeed spoken of as ruling;[b] but that it was a subordinate authority flowing from Timothy and subject to his control, is evident from his having authority to rule them, restrain them, praise or censure them, as the case might require, and select others when he thought proper, and ordain them to the same offices.[c]

From the passages just referred to in the Epistles to Timothy, as well as from the whole tenor of those Epistles, it is most undeniable that the government, the controlling authority, in the Church at Ephesus, was not in a common council of Presbyters, but in Timothy.

276. From the identity of the purpose with which Titus and Timothy were sent to Crete and Ephesus, and the close resemblance between the directions given to the former and the latter, and from the general tenor of the Epistle to Titus, it is evident that the government of the Church in Crete was in him.

277. In short, there can no instance be produced from the New Testament in which a common council of Presbyters governed the Church independently of the control of the Apostles, or of those whom they placed as their successors in authority; as Paul set Timothy over the Church at Ephesus.

278. It is evident from this investigation of the purport of these passages from Jerome, that he agrees with Dr. Miller in *one particular only; viz.* that the Church was governed by Presbyters in the commencement of the preaching of the Gospel; and *in this one particular* he is undoubtedly wrong, having no authority in the New Testament for it, and producing no testimony whatever to support it. In all other respects Jerome differs totally from Dr. Miller.

Jerome says that this form of government was abrogated, and episcopacy established after an occurrence which happened in the time of the Apostles, and that they appointed James and Mark, and Timothy and Titus to be Bishops over different Churches, (§222, 225, 226, 243, 267 to 269.)

Dr. Miller says, "that clerical imparity had begun to appear in the *third*, and was established in the *fourth* century."[d]

Dr. Miller says, that episcopacy 'owed its origin to the ambition of ministers, when every one began to think that those whom he baptized were rather his than CHRIST'S.' (§270.)

Jerome represents episcopacy as established by the Apostles, *to put down* these ambitious views of the Presbyters, [§221, 226, 271.]

Dr. Miller says, that "while Jerome maintains the *parity* of all ministers of the Gospel in the primitive Church, he entirely excludes Deacons from being an order of clergy at all."[e]

Jerome speaks often of Deacons as ministers,[f] and asserts that *imparity* was established by the Apostles, and that a Bishop was

b 1 Tim. v. 17.
c 1 Tim. iii.; v. 17, &c.
d MILLER'S *Reply*, p. 189. [p. 336, 2d *ed.*]
e MILLER'S *Letters*, p. 188. [p. 123, 2d *ed.*]
f BOWDEN'S *Letters*, Vol. I. p. 7; [p. 3, 5, 2d *ed.*] also §247, 257.

Digitized by Google

set over the Presbyters to put an end to the divisions that were growing out of their ambition, (§221, 243): and while Jerome is urging the claims of the Presbyters, the utmost he proposes, is that they shall have such a share in the administration of the Church under the Bishops, as the seventy had under Moses, (§223;) and even this he does not ask as a right, but says, "that they ought to rule the Church in common, imitating Moses, who, when he might *alone* rule the people of Israel, chose *seventy* with whom he might judge the people."[g]

279. Dr. Miller next quotes the following passage from Hilary, which is given entire. He says:

"Hilary, who wrote about the year 367, in his commentary on *Ephesians* iv. 2, has the following passage, 'After that Churches were planted in all places, and officers ordained, matters were settled *otherwise than they were in the beginning*. And hence it is, that the Apostle's writings *do not in all things agree according to the present constitution of the Church*: because they were written under the first rise of the Church; for he calls Timothy, who was created a *Presbyter* by him, a *Bishop*, for *so at first the Presbyters were called*; among whom this was the course of governing the Churches, that as one withdrew another took his place; and in Egypt, even at this day, the Presbyters *ordain* in the Bishop's absence. But because the following Presbyters began to be found unworthy to hold the first place, the method *was changed*, the Council providing that not order, but merit should create a Bishop.'

280. "In this passage, we have not only an express declaration that the Christian Church, in the days of Hilary, had deviated from its primitive pattern; but also that this deviation had a particular respect to the name and office of *Bishop*, which in the beginning was the same with *Presbyter*. He also declares, that, notwithstanding this change, *Presbyters*, even then, sometimes ordained; and that the reason of their not continuing to exercise this power was, that many of them being unfit to be trusted with such a power, it was *taken out of their hands*, as a *prudential* measure, by the authority of the Church."[h]

281. The following is an exact translation of the whole passage, (being a comment on Ephesians iv. 11, 12,) in which Hilary or Ambrose, first explains the meaning of the words *Apostles*, *Prophets*, *Evangelists*, &c. The few words in parenthesis are supplied. They are necessary to express the meaning of the Latin in English, which the reader will perceive.

And he gave some Apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of CHRIST."

282. (a) *Apostles* are Bishops. (b) *Prophets* are expounders of the Scriptures; although in the very beginning there were prophets, such as Agabus, and the four prophesying virgins, as is contained in the Acts of the Apostles, for the sake of recommending the beginning of the faith: but now expounders are called Prophets. (c) *Evangelists* are Deacons, as was Philip. Although they may not be Priests, nevertheless they can preach without the

g MILLER'S *Letters*, p. 183; [p 119, 2d *ed.*] italics as in his book.
h MILLER'S *Letters*, p. 190. [p. 125, 2d *ed.*]

Digitized by Google

pulpit, as both Stephen and Philip are related (to have done.) (d) *Pastor* may be readers, who by reading feed the listening people, because 'not b bread alone liveth man, but by every word which proceedeth from the mouth of God.' (e) *Masters*[i] are exorcists, because in the Church they restrain and check the restless; or those who used to imbue children with letters an reading, as is the custom of the Jews, whose tradition has been handed dow to us, which by negligence has grown out of use.

(f) Among these, *after the Bishop*, he is understood to be superior, wh is said to prophesy, on account of unlocking the hidden meaning of th Scriptures, particularly because he brings forth the words of the future hope which order may now be of the presbytery. For in the Bishop are all th orders, because he is the first Priest, that is, he is the chief of the Priest (*princeps sacerdotum*) and Prophet, and Evangelist, and of the faithful t fulfil the other offices in the service of the Church. (g) Nevertheless afte Churches were established every where, and the offices were regulated matters were established otherwise than in the beginning. (h) For, at firs all taught, and all baptized, on whatsoever days or times there might hav been occasion. (i) For neither did Philip seek a time or a day in which h might baptize the Eunuch, nor interpose a fast. Neither did Paul and Sila defer the time in which they baptized the jailor with all his. Neither ha Peter a Deacon, nor did he seek a day, when he baptized Cornelius with a his house: nor (did he do it) himself, but he commanded the brethren wh had gone with him from Joppa to baptize (them.) For as yet none but th seven Deacons had been ordained. (k) That therefore the people might in crease and multiply, it was granted to all in the beginning to preach an baptize, and explain the Scriptures in the Church. (l) But when th Church embraced all places, places of assembling were appointed, and gove nors, and the rest of the offices in the Churches were ordained, that no on of the clergy who had not been ordained (to it,) might dare to pre-occupy a office which he might know was not entrusted or granted to him: and th Church began to be governed in another manner and with foresight; be cause if all might do the same thing, it would be irrational, and the thin would appear common and of very little value. (m) Hence, therefore, it is that now neither Deacons preach among the people, nor do the clergy nor th laity baptize, nor are believers baptized on every day, unless sick. (n Therefore the writings of the Apostle do not agree in every thing with th practice which is now in the Church, because they were written in the ver beginning. (o) For he calls Timothy, created by him a Presbyter, Bishop because at first Presbyters were called Bishops: that one ceasing, the fol lowing one might succeed him. Finally, in Egypt Presbyters confirm, i the Bishop is not present. But because the following Presbyters began t be found unworthy to hold the first place, the mode was changed; the Coun cil seeing, that not order, but merit should make a Bishop, appointed by th choice of many priests, lest an unworthy person should rashly usurp (th office,) and be a stumbling-block to many."

[There are a few lines more, not relating to the controverted points, whicl will be given at the close of this Essay, in the Latin.]

283. In this comment, Hilary commences with an explana tion of the words, Apostles, Prophets, &c. (See sentences to g.) Having done this, he says, after Churches were every where established, and the offices were regulated, things were settled otherwise than in the beginning (g); and he immediately

i The word in the original is διδασκαλος, *præceptor* or *magister—teacher* or *master*; the latter is the word Hilary uses.

Digitized by Google

proceeds to say in what respect. *For, at first*, all taught, all baptized, and baptism was performed at any time it might be desired (h.) Here are three particulars which were settled otherwise when the Churches were regulated (g). But *now*, neither do Deacons preach among the people, nor do the clergy nor the laity baptize, nor are believers baptized on every day, unless sick (m). And, *therefore*, he immediately adds (n), the writings of the Apostle do not agree in every thing with the practice now in the Church, because they were written in the very beginning. (See §180 to 183.)

284. This change was made, according to Hilary, *when the Church embraced all places*, &c. *Then* places of assembling were appointed governors; and the rest of the offices in the Church were ordained, that no one of the clergy might dare to assume an office to which he had not been ordained, (§282, 1.)

That these things were done by the Apostles has been already fully shown; and indeed is most manifest from the bare reading of Paul's Epistles. That places of assembly were appointed during the time of the Apostles, is shown by reference to the following places in a single Epistle: (1 Corinth. v. 4; xi. 17, 18, 20, 22, 33; xiv. 19, 23, 26, 28, 34, 35; xvi. 19.) For evidence that governors were by them appointed, and different officers in the Church ordained, of whom no one was to exceed the bounds of his proper office, see the following places in one Epistle: (1 Timothy i. 3, 18, 20; ii. 7, 11, 12; iii. 2, &c., 10, &c., 14, &c.; iv. 11, 12, &c.; v. 7, &c., 14, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22; vi. 3, 13.) See also Titus i. 5, &c., particularly 10, 11, 13; the whole second chapter, particularly the last verse; and the tenth verse of the third chapter.

285. It follows irresistibly from a comparison of these passages (§283, 284) that what Dr. Miller calls a deviation from the primitive pattern, (§280) was the regulation of the Church by the Apostles themselves (§228, 229, 230.) We know that they did settle things at different periods as necessity required: of which the determination of some important points at Jerusalem, when Paul and Barnabas went there together, the second time, from Antioch, is an instance, (Acts xv.) That occurrence took place near twenty years after Paul had been preaching. The first journey to Jerusalem with Barnabas was seventeen years after he commenced preaching,[k] and the second was a considerable time after that.[l]

286. Dr. Miller asserts that we have Hilary's express declaration in the passage quoted, [§279, 282] that the deviation from the primitive pattern had a particular respect to the name and office of *Bishop*, which in the beginning was the same with *Presbyter*, (§280.)

287. Hilary refers to three things which were regulated when Churches were established every where, in neither of which is *Bishop* mentioned, (§283.) Moreover Hilary does not say that the *Bishop* in the beginning was the same with the *Presbyter*

k See p. 207.

l Acts xii. 25; xiii. xiv; xv.

Digitized by Google

in name and office. He says, *at first Presbyters were called Bishops;* but, so far from intending to say that the episcopal office was exercised by these Presbyters, he says in the very first sentence of his comment, '*Apostles are Bishops,*' (§282, a:) and in a subsequent sentence, he says, '*After the Bishop* are the Prophets, who may now be of the order of Presbyters:' and again, '*In the Bishop are all the orders,* because he is the first Priest, that is, *the chief of the Priests.*—(§282, f.)

288. In the same passage Hilary says, Paul calls Timothy, created by him a Presbyter, Bishop, (§282, o.) This passage shows what reliance is to be placed on these speculations, which Dr. Miller first protests against in the most pointed terms, (§234, 235) and then brings forward as testimony, sometimes declaring that they are decisive of the controversy, (§218.) Paul calls Timothy neither *Presbyter* nor *Bishop* in any of his writings. Moreover Timothy was a Presbyter many years before his appointment to the bishopric of Ephesus, and when he received that appointment, Hilary himself says Paul gave him the apostolic rod.

289. That Timothy was a Presbyter many years before his appointment to be Bishop of the Church of Ephesus, is evident from some passages of Paul's Epistles.

Paul first met with Timothy when he was preaching at Derbe and Lystra. He was then a disciple, and being well recommended by the brethren, *Paul would have him to go forth with him.*[m] Immediately after this they were together at Philippi, Thessalonica, &c. both preaching the Gospel, as appears from the first Epistle to the Thessalonians. This Epistle was addressed to them by Paul, Silvanus, and *Timothy.* They speak in the first and second chapters of OUR *Gospel* repeatedly. In the second chapter they say, *But even after that* WE *had suffered before and were shamefully entreated, as ye know, at Philippi,* WE *were bold in our* GOD *to speak unto you the Gospel of* GOD *with much contention. For* OUR *exhortation was not of deceit, nor of uncleanness, nor in guile: But as* WE *were allowed of* GOD *to be put in trust with the Gospel, even so* WE *speak, not as pleasing men, but* GOD, *which trieth our hearts. For neither at any time used we flattering words, as ye know, nor a cloak of covetousness;* GOD *is witness: Nor of men sought* WE *glory, neither of you, nor yet of others, when we might have been burdensome, as the Apostles of* CHRIST. Throughout the chapter similar language is used, and in the 9th verse they say, WE *preached unto you the Gospel of* GOD.

The second Epistle to the Corinthians was written by Paul and Timothy; in which it is said,[n] *For the Son of* GOD, JESUS CHRIST, *who was preached among you by us,* EVEN *by me and Silvanus and* TIMOTHEUS, *was not yea and nay, but in him was yea.*

290. This Epistle to the Corinthians was written nearly a year

m Acts xvi. 1—3.

n 2 Cor. i. 19.

Digitized by Google

after Paul left Ephesus, (§82.) He and Timothy had continued for three years preceding that time in that city,[o] and had left Corinth some time before he went there.[p] It was therefore at least four years before this Epistle was written, that Timothy was preaching at Corinth: and as he was at Corinth about two years,[q] and went there after preaching at Thessalonica,[r] he had been preaching certainly six years when the second Epistle to the Corinthians was written. It was after this a short time that Paul gave Timothy charge of the Church at Ephesus, (§82, 83, 21:) and it was while in that charge that Hilary says he received the apostolic rod. The following is the passage.

291. "He [the LORD] nevertheless has those whom he sent Apostles with a rod, as Paul testifies, saying, What will ye? shall I come unto you with a rod, or in love, and in the spirit of meekness? This rod also the Apostles gave to Timothy, saying, reprove, rebuke, exhort."[s]

292. Dr. Miller next represents Hilary as 'declaring that notwithstanding this change, *Presbyters*, even then, sometimes ordained.' (§279, 280.)

Hilary's words are, "Finally in Egypt Presbyters confirm if the Bishop is not present." (§282, o.)

293. Dr. Miller in his translation of this passage gives *ordain* as the English of *consignant*. Ainsworth renders it *seal*, *sign*, *mark*, *register*, *record*, *confirm*, and *ratify*. There is not one of these words that does not correspond with the real signification of *confirming* by the Bishop. The person who is confirmed *ratifies* or *confirms* by his own act the engagement made for him in baptism, and is *sealed*, *signed*, *marked*, *registered*, or *recorded* a member of CHRIST's Church. But there is not one of these words that has any reference to setting apart by ordination.

294. Dr. Miller represents Hilary as declaring that *Presbyters ordained*, using no words of limitation, (§280.) Hilary's words limit the practice of Presbyters *confirming* to *Egypt*, (§282, o.)

295. Hilary represents this practice as having obtained only when the Bishop was absent. Dr. Miller uses the word *sometimes*, which does not limit the practice to the particular case stated by Hilary, but leaves us to conclude it was done sometimes by Presbyters and sometimes by the Bishop, indifferently, (§280.)

296. In the passage in Hilary, there are no such words as 'even at this day,' which are found in Dr. Miller's translation, (§279.)

---

o Acts xix. 22; xx. 1, 31; also Section 5.

p Acts xviii. 18 to 23.

q Acts xviii. 11, 18.

r Acts xvii. 14, 15; xviii. 1, 5.

s "Habet tamen quos et cum virga Apostolos miserit, sicut Paulus testificatur, dicens, Quid vultis? in virga veniam ad vos, an in charitate et spiritu mansuetudinis? Hanc virgam etiam et Timotheo dedit Apostolus, dicens, Argue, obsecra, increpa." S. AMBROSE III. 130. D.

Digitized by Google

297. Dr. Miller further says of Hilary, that "he also declares that the reason of their not continuing to exercise this power, [*viz.* of ordaining] was, that many of them being unfit to be trusted with such a power, it was *taken out of their hands*, as a *prudential* measure, by the authority of the Church," (§280.)

In this passage are expressed the nature of the change, and the reasons for it; in neither does Dr. Miller's representation agree with Hilary's words.

298. Dr. Miller represents Hilary as saying, that the change consisted in the Presbyters being deprived of the power of ordaining, because many of them were unfit to be trusted with it.

Hilary says, in the beginning the bishopric was given to the Presbyters in order—'one ceasing or departing, the following one succeeded him,' (§282, o;) that the change consisted, in making *merit* and *not order*, the guide in choosing a Bishop; and that the reason of the change was, because the Presbyters who followed *in order* were sometimes found unworthy *to hold the first place*—' primatus,' the primacy, (§282, o.)

299. In short, Dr. Miller represents Hilary as saying, that *the power of ordaining* was that which the Presbyters enjoyed, and were deprived of because many of them were unworthy to be trusted with IT. Hilary says, it was *the succession in regular order* that they were deprived of, because the Presbyter who followed in order was sometimes found unfit to occupy THE FIRST PLACE. There is not a word about ordination in the passage, (§282, o.)

300. By this mode of managing the argument, Dr. Miller contrives to prove to his entire satisfaction, he tells us, that Ignatius, Polycarp, Irenæus, Cyprian, and many others, whose writings one would suppose could not be misunderstood, are 'entirely in his favour.' He goes on after Hilary, to quote Chrysostom, Theodoret, Primasius, and Sedulius, who wrote in the fifth century, much in the same manner with those heretofore noticed. The passages quoted are comments on the Epistle to Timothy and Titus, in which they show, what is obvious, that Presbyters were then called *Bishops* or *Overseers*, from their office of overseeing the flock. But that they had no idea that these persons possessed what since the days of the Apostles has been called the *episcopal* power, and what was then called the *apostolical*, (or what Dr. Miller's decisive witness, Jerome, calls the *apostolical rod*, §266; see also §291,) is evident from the works of Bishop Taylor; who quotes two of these very persons, Chrysostom and Primasius, as concurring, with many others, in the testimony that Paul wrote the first Epistle to Timothy to instruct him in his episcopal office, and, in him, all Bishops; and he refers to their comment on this very Epistle to Timothy, for the sentiments quoted. Theodoret he quotes, as calling Timothy "Bishop of the Asiatics." Chrysostom says, "Paul saith in his Epistle to Timothy, *Fulfil thy ministry*, being then

Digitized by Google

a Bishop; for that he was a Bishop appears by Paul's writing thus unto him, *Lay hands suddenly on no man.*[t] It is remarkable that these passages in Chrysostom's observations on the same Epistle should not have attracted Dr. Miller's attention.

The very quotation of Dr. Miller from Chrysostom, is entirely destructive of the Presbyterian doctrine. For it shows the Bishop had *the power of ordination*, which makes him the source of all ministerial authority, as all antiquity says he was.

301. Dr. Miller makes a very strange declaration in a note on the last sentence of his quotation from Chrysostom. The quotation ends thus: "In *ordination alone* they have *gone beyond* the Presbyters." The note is in these words: "This perfectly agrees with the representation of Jerome, (with whom Chrysostom was nearly contemporary) who says, that the only right which Bishops had *gained* over Presbyters, *in his day*, was that of *ordination*."[u]

302. Dr. Miller does not refer to any passage in Jerome for this, and from the manner in which his quotations and translations are made, it cannot be admitted by any one as Jerome's declaration, without further authority. This is a matter on which Jerome is entirely qualified to testify; *viz.* the government of the Church *in his day*. But it is not credible that he has said "that the only right which Bishops had *gained* over Presbyters, *in his day*, was that of *ordination*," when we recollect how he complains of the stateliness and pride of some Bishops, and sometimes wonders they do not break to pieces schismatic Presbyters with their apostolic and iron *rod*, (§266.) See also some other of his expressions in preceding Sections, (§154.) It is difficult to conceive, when we read such declarations as this of Dr. Miller respecting Jerome and Chrysostom, that he could have looked into the Ecclesiastical Histories of Eusebius, Ruffinus, Socrates, Sozomen and Theodoret. These works, all written about that time or a little before, are full of statements showing the difference of order of Presbyter and Bishop, the necessity of a second ordination on making a Bishop of a Presbyter or Deacon, and of the extraordinary authority of the Bishops. You do not indeed find these things asserted; because nobody thinks of frequently asserting a familiar truth —what every body knows. But the evidence is not the less strong for that. Thus, we read, that Nectarius, Bishop of Constantinople, being dead, John, a Presbyter of Antioch, was chosen in his place, and Theophilus, Bishop of Alexandria, ordained him Bishop. It is stated that he was ordained Presbyter by Evagrius.[v] "Meletius being dead at Constantinople, *where he had gone to ordain Gregory Nazianzen*," &c.[w] "It hap-

t BOWDEN'S *Letters*, Vol. I. p. 39. [Vol. I. p. 20, 2d *ed.*]
u MILLER'S *Letters*, p. 191 [p. 225, 2d *ed.*] italics as printed in his book.
v SOCRAT. *Hist. Ecclesiast.* Lib. VI. cap. ii. iii. w *Ibid:* cap. iii.

Digitized by Google

pened at that time that the Bishop of Ephesus died, on which account a necessity was laid on John (who was Bishop of Constantinople, as above mentioned,) to go to Ephesus to constitute a Bishop." Arrived there, he found considerable contention for the office, and settled the matter by constituting his Deacon Heraclides, Bishop, when both parties laid aside their contention.[x] Nothing but necessity would have induced these men, often old, to make a long journey to ordain a Bishop: they must go because the Presbyters could not ordain. There were sixty Presbyters in Constantinople, and yet Meletius, Bishop of Antioch, went there to ordain Gregory Nazianzen (as above stated;) and note, when this was done, the matter was recorded with care, and particularity proportioned to its importance—(and messengers were sent to the Churches even in distant countries to give the information.) Thus, "Theophilus ordains John. He being ordained to the office of Bishop, was placed in the seat on the 26th day of the month of February, in the consulate following that in which Honorius, Emperor of Rome, and Eutychianus at Constantinople, administered the republic."[y]

303. Dr. Miller, in his remarks on Eusebius' *History*, makes some extraordinary declarations. He says,[z] "When Eusebius gives us formal catalogues of Bishops in succession, from the Apostles' time until his own, he himself warns us against laying too much stress on his information; frankly confessing, 'that he was obliged to rely much on *tradition*, and that he could trace no footsteps of other historians going before him, only in a few narratives.'"

304. It is the more important to show that this statement is not at all what Eusebius says, because it strikes at the root of the Christian religion. If the above declaration is true, three hundred years after the death of our SAVIOUR, there was nothing in the Christian system which we could depend upon. But it is not true. There were many men of distinguished learning who preceded Eusebius, whose works are yet extant; and many whose works are not, but were then in being, as we know from the quotations made from them by Eusebius. There yet remain the Epistles of *Clement*, *Hermas*, *Polycarp*, *Ignatius*, *Cyprian*, the whole folio work of *Irenæus* on a great variety of subjects and doctrines, and likewise that of *Tertullian*, and of *Origen*, &c. &c. It is not true; and Eusebius has not said it.

305. Eusebius, after stating his purpose of writing a history of the Church, and professing his inability to do it justice, ('for it is beyond my strength,' he says,) proceeds in the fourth sentence of his work thus:

"For we now first attempting this subject, endeavour to enter upon it as upon a deserted and unused road; and although we pray GOD to be to us a leader in the way, and that the power of CHRIST may be present co-opera-

x *Ibid.* Lib. VI. cap. xi.
y SOCRAT. *Hist. Eccles.* Lib. VI. cap. ii.
z *Letters*, p. 197, [p. 129, 2d *ed.*]

Digitized by Google

ting, nevertheless we can no where discover the bare footsteps of those who may have entered the same way before us, except only on some small occasions, in which some, writing of their own times, have left some short narratives, like small lights, while they sent out their voices from afar, and calling from above, as from an eminence, they teach where to go, and how the course of the history may be directed without error and danger. Collecting, therefore, whatever we shall think will aid the proposed work, which is here and there related by them, and plucking as flowers from the meadows of reason, the suitable words of those who have formerly written, we shall attempt to reduce them into one body, in a historical narration, having this desire, that if we cannot all things, we may nevertheless particularly preserve from oblivion the successions of the most illustrious Apostles of our SAVIOUR, in those Churches which are still famous and renowned."

306. These remarks of Eusebius are a kind of preface to his whole work. He does not warn us against laying too much stress on his information. On the contrary, though he mentions that none had preceded him in writing a general history of the Church, and that he has no other aid than the narratives that different persons had left of the history of their own times, he represents these as lights in his path, and them as persons placed on an eminence, and showing where 'the course of his history may be directed without error and danger.'

307. He does not 'frankly confess that he was obliged to rely much on tradition.' He does not even mention tradition in the whole chapter, which is very remarkable; because the ancient writers frequently used the word, and meant by it, as the word literally signifies, *a handing down* by the Apostles—and Paul in one of his Epistles urges those to whom he is writing to pay attention to the *tradition*. Eusebius, however, says nothing about it.

308. Moreover he does not give us the warning, nor make the frank confession spoken of by Dr. Miller, (but not to be found in Eusebius;) '*when giving us formal catalogues of Bishops in succession.*' On the contrary, this is precisely that point upon which he speaks with most confidence of succeeding, (§305.)

309. After giving his own representation of Eusebius' account of these lists, Dr. Miller quotes what he calls '*another confession*' of Eusebius, 'in the words of the great Milton.' Dr. Miller frequently introduces decided partizans of the cause he is advocating, with the epithet of 'the great' or 'the learned,' to give weight to what he advances, without any intimation of their true character. Milton was a great poet, but so violent a partizan among those who overturned the English government and the episcopal Church in the seventeenth century, that Cromwell made him Latin secretary both to himself and the Parliament.

310. He says:

"Eusebius, the ancientest writer of Church History extant, confesses in the fourth chapter of his third Book, that it was no easy matter to tell who were those that were left Bishops of the Churches by the Apostles, more than from what a man might gather from the *Acts of the Apostles*, and the *Epistles of St. Paul*, in which number he reckons *Timothy* for *Bishop of*

Digitized by Google

Ephesus. So as may plainly appear, that this tradition of Bishopping Timothy over Ephesus, was but taken for granted out of that place in St. Paul, which was only an entreating him to tarry at Ephesus, to do something left him in charge," &c.[a]

311. In this chapter, which Milton quotes, Eusebius says:

"That Paul, preaching to the Gentiles, laid the foundation of Churches from Jerusalem round about to Illyricum, manifestly appears from his own words and from those which Luke has written in the Acts. In which provinces, however, Peter preached CHRIST to those who were of the circumcision, and delivered the doctrine of the New Testament; and this is rendered manifest by his words, and by the Epistle, which we have said is undoubtedly his, which he wrote to the Hebrews scattered through Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, and Asia. But how many and who of these, as sincere imitators, may have been esteemed to be able to feed the Churches founded by the Apostles, may not be easy to say, except so far as one may collect them from the words of Paul. For there were innumerable co-operators with him, and, as he called them, fellow-soldiers, of whom many have obtained an indelible remembrance from him, because that he continually bore witness respecting them in his Epistles. Luke, likewise, in the Acts, recounting the more celebrated of them, mentions them by name. Timothy indeed is mentioned (or written down) as having first obtained the bishopric of the Ephesian parish; as likewise Titus of the Cretan Churches."

Eusebius next proceeds to speak of Luke himself, and then says, "Of the rest of the followers of Paul, Crescens has the testimony of the Apostle himself that he was sent into Gaul. But Linus whom he relates in his second Epistle to Timothy to have been present with him at Rome, it has already been shown, obtained the bishopric of the Roman Church, the first after Peter. But Clemens, who was appointed third Bishop of the Roman Church, is proved to have been a fellow-labourer and fellow-soldier of Paul by his testimony. In addition to these things, another Dionysius, (one) of the ancients, and pastor of the parish[b] of the Corinthians, writes that Dionysius the Areopagite, who, Luke writes in the Acts, first believed after the preaching of Paul in the Areopagus to the Athenians, was the first Bishop of the Church of the Athenians. But in the progress of the narration, we shall speak *in its own place* of the successors of the Apostles, in the time in which every one succeeded. At present we return to those things which follow in the history."

312. The question here is, Who are those intended by Eusebius in the passage quoted? *viz.* in the words, "But how many and who of those, as sincere imitators, may have been esteemed to be able to feed the Churches founded by the Apostles, may not be easy to say, except so far as any one may collect from the words of Paul."

---

a MILTON *against Prelatical Episcopacy*, p. 3—quoted by Dr. MILLER, *Letters*, p. 198, [p. 129, 2d *ed.*]

b Note; the word *parish* is not limited in Eusebius' history to signify what is now commonly understood by the term—*the charge of a single Presbyter*. Eusebius uses the word in speaking of cities in which there were numbers of Presbyters. Thus, in Book III. chap. xi. he speaks of 'the *parish* of Jerusalem,' where there were many thousands of Christians and many Presbyters, even in the early days of the Gospel, (Acts xv. 6; xxi. 20.) In Book IV. chap. xix. he speaks of 'the *parish* of Alexandria,' which was also a very large Church at the time spoken of, in the latter part of the second century: and in Book VI. chap. iii. he speaks of 'the *parish* of Carthage' in connexion with Cyprian's name, when we know there were numerous Presbyters in it, from his Epistles. See §191 to 195.

Digitized by Google

313. The answer may be seen in the next sentence: "For his *co-operators* were innumerable," &c.

314. By the word *co-operators*, in this passage, is necessarily meant, either the whole number of those who co-operated with Paul, or a select number from them, who were esteemed to be able to feed the Churches.

315. The whole of these men, however, were actually engaged in feeding the Churches; Presbyters as well as Apostles.[c] Paul, when leaving the Presbyters of Ephesus, charged them to feed the flock,[d] and refers to this duty of their's in his first Epistle to Timothy,[e] at the same time that that and the succeeding verses, as well as the whole tenor of the Epistle, show that they were subject to the authority of Timothy. Many passages might be pointed out, in which Presbyters and Deacons, both, preached the word, which is the obvious meaning of feeding the Churches.[f]

316. As, therefore, the whole number of Paul's co-operators were engaged in feeding the Churches, the idea that Eusebius was speaking of a select number, falls to the ground; and he intended by the words in question, that it would not be an easy matter to say how many and who were Paul's co-operators, for they were innumerable. This, too, is obviously a more natural construction of the sentence, than that it would not be an easy matter to say who were selected from the whole number of co-operators, because the latter were so numerous. There is no connexion between the number of one and that of the other.

317. That Eusebius did not intend what Milton says, *viz.* 'that it was no easy matter to tell who were those that were left Bishops of the Churches by the Apostles,' is obvious, moreover, from two other considerations.

318. Eusebius uses the expression, "for *his* (Paul's) co-operators were innumerable," &c. Therefore, his remarks respect Paul's co-operators, and all that follows shows it. Every person named is one of those connected with Paul; and after mentioning several of them, he says, "*Of the rest of the followers of Paul*, Crescens has the testimony of the Apostle that he was sent to Gaul," &c.

319. Secondly, In proceeding to give an account of "some of the most celebrated" of the followers of Paul, he mentions among others Luke, who never was appointed Bishop over any Church, that I have learned: and likewise Crescens, of whom the same may be said.

Eusebius, therefore, certainly does not speak, in this passage, of those who were left Bishops of the Churches by the Apostles; because he speaks first, of *Paul's* followers particularly; and

---

c See this distinction between *Apostles* and *Presbyters* made by Luke, and by the Apostles themselves, four times in one chapter, Acts xv. 4, 6, 22, and 23.

d Acts xx. 28 to 30. e 1 Tim. v. 17.

f Compare Acts xx. 28 to 30, with 1 Tim. i. 3, for the identity of these expressions; and for evidence that Deacons as well as Presbyters preached the word, see note to Section 209 and Section 265.

Digitized by Google

secondly, of them in general, some of whom were Bishops and some not.

320. Much less did Eusebius mean the successors of the Apostles: for, in the very sentence following the notice of the last of Paul's followers whom he mentions, he says, "But in the progress of the narration we shall speak, *in its own place*, of the successors of the Apostles," &c.

321. How, indeed, could Eusebius possibly have said, "that he was obliged to rely much on tradition" (§303) respecting the successors of the Apostles, when he had the entire list of Irenæus, contained in his works, (§130) all of which he had an opportunity of reading in the original Greek; as well as the list of Tertullian, (§212;) both of whom were born about the close of the life of St. John,[g] (§107) and conversed with men who had conversed with the Apostles; both of whom were men of great learning, exalted character, great zeal for the purity of the Church, and highly esteemed writers against heresies;[h] both of whom had the best opportunities to inform themselves; and both speak in the most confident manner of the certainty of their information, challenging the heretical Churches to produce the series of their Bishops from the Apostles, as the apostolical Churches were prepared to do, (§130, 185.)

322. How irrational, indeed, is it to suppose that such men as Clement, Irenæus, Tertullian, Cyprian, and many who preceded them, some of whom were men of high rank and fortune before their conversion, and all men of general information and extensive acquaintance with men and things—how absurd to suppose that they kept no account, no record of things so deeply interesting to them; for the sake of which they sacrificed immediately their standing, their connexions, their wealth, and eventually, almost without an exception, their lives.

323. But what says Eusebius on this subject? In the third chapter of his third book he writes thus:

"But the Epistle of Peter, the one which is called the former, has been received beyond controversy. This the ancient Presbyters formerly used in their writings without any hesitation. That however which is called the latter, we do not learn to be legitimate. And yet, because it appears to be good in many respects, it has been often used with the other Scriptures. But the Acts, which are attributed to him, and the Gospel which is said to be his, and the publication inscribed to him and called his Revelation, we know no where among the Catholic writings handed down, so far as that neither any commentator of the ancients, nor of our time, has used their testimony. But in the progress of the history, together with the annotation of the succession,

---

g Irenæus speaking of John's Revelation says, "Neither indeed was it seen a long time since, but almost in our day, about the end of the reign of Domitian." "Neque enim ante multum temporis visum est, sed pene sub nostro sæculo, ad finem Domitiani imperii." IRENÆUS *contra Hæreses*, Lib. V. cap. XXX.

h EUSEBIUS calls Irenæus "Precipuus Irenæus," *the excellent Irenæus*, and quotes his works frequently. He speaks highly also of Tertullian, and says he is a witness worthy of credit. *Eccles. Hist.* Book IV. chap. XXV.; and Book V. chap. v.

Digitized by Google

I shall receive this reward of my labour, that I may signify who (were) ecclesiastical writers in their day, and what perverse Scriptures (or writings) they have used, and what Scriptures may be legitimate and acknowledged by every one, and what have not been esteemed among these by them."

324. On this passage one or two remarks must be made.

First, It is obvious from the whole tenor of it, that there were not a few ancient writings and ancient commentators: and this likewise appears from many passages of the History of Eusebius, in which he quotes works not now extant, unless buried in the ancient libraries in the Mahometan countries, once the chief seat of the Christian religion.[i]

It may be also observed that the word *tradition* is not confined to the handing down by oral communication; for Eusebius speaks here of *writings handed down*. The same is shown by what he says of Hegesippus. "Among these Hegesippus is known, many of whose sayings we have already used, that from his *tradition* we might adduce some contemporary with the Apostles. He, therefore, having *written* in five commentaries the true *tradition* of the apostolic doctrine in a very simple historical composition, signifies in what time it was made known, and writes in the following manner, of those feigned ones which in ancient (or primitive) times appeared."[k]

325. Secondly, It may be remarked that Eusebius derives the evidence of the authenticity of the different books of the New Testament, and that of the succession of the Bishops from the same source, precisely; and better he could not have, in the nature of things. All who live after the time in which the Gospel was first published, must depend on the testimony of those who then lived and saw what passed, or heard the testimony of those who did. This is what Eusebius rests the credit of the Scriptures upon—*the writings of the ancients—the commentators of ancient times:* note, that he himself was born about the year 264 and died in 338, only about *two hundred* years after these whom he calls ancients.

326. Neither is it true that Eusebius merely gives us formal catalogues of Bishops from the Apostles down to his time. He mentions them, as he promised he would, each in the time in which he succeeded, (§311.) The following is a specimen of his manner of speaking of the successors of the Apostles in the government of the different Churches. It is taken from the first Chapter of his second Book: "Of the distribution of the Apos-

---

i Eusebius mentions a number of writers in a single passage. "But in those times flourished in the Church Hegesippus, whom we have known from the ancients: and Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth, and another, Pinytus by name, a Cretan Bishop, and Philip also, and Apollinarius, and Meliton, and Musanus, and Modestus, and the excellent Irenæus, whose right opinion of the apostolical doctrine and the sound faith has come even unto us, in (their) writings." *Eccles. Hist.* Lib. IV. cap. xxii. He had also the voluminous writings of the most learned Origen, and of very many others, whose names are continually recurring in his history.

k Euseb. *Eccles. Hist.* Lib. IV. cap. viii.

Digitized by Google

ties after the ascension of CHRIST;" the first book being occupied with transactions during his life. It is the very first case mentioned. The passage is as follows: "This James, whom the ancients, on account of the pre-eminence of his virtue, called by the surname Just, first obtained, *they write*, the episcopal seat of the Church at Jerusalem. Clemens asserts this in the sixth book of his *Delineations*, (or *Informations*,) *writing thus:* For, Peter, he says, and James and John, after the ascension of the SAVIOUR, although verily they were preferred before others by the LORD himself, nevertheless did not claim this glory for themselves, but appointed James the Just Bishop of the Jews."[1]

327. Moreover, when, after mentioning one by one the Bishops of several Churches, as of that of Rome, of Alexandria, &c., with the year in which they obtained the episcopate, —— when he gives a catalogue of the Roman Bishops, it is taken from 'the excellent Irenæus,' as he calls him, after noticing his succession to the episcopate of Lyons, on the martyrdom of Pothinus. It is taken from the same chapter which has already been cited in speaking of Irenæus's testimony, (§130) and there is not one syllable of observation given with it calculated in the slightest degree to detract from its perfect credibility.[m]

328. It may be remarked that there is, in the passage given above from Eusebius, (§323) clear proof of the utter fallacy of that argument which is the main prop of the doctrine of the validity of ordination by Presbyters: *viz.* that every man who occasionally uses the word Presbyter, as a general term to include the Bishop as well as the ordinary Presbyters, evinces thereby his belief that there is no difference of order between them. Eusebius in this passage uses the word to signify the ancient Church writers and commentators without distinction: and yet in the 21st Chapter of his 4th Book he speaks of nine writers, two of whom he expressly calls Bishops, and the third, Irenæus, we know was likewise a Bishop, (§324.) Dr. Miller might, therefore, have brought forward Eusebius as favouring

---

1 [Dr. Cook has quoted from a Latin translation of Eusebius, in which the passage stands as follows: "Hunc Jacobum, quem et Justum cognomento veteres propter virtutis prærogativam vocarunt, primum episcopalem Hierosolymitanæ ecclesiæ sedem sortitum esse *scribunt*. Clemens hoc in sexto Hypotyposeon libro *sic scribens* asserit: Petrus enim, inquit, et Jacobus et Joannes post assumptionem Servatoris, quamvis ab ipso quoque domino aliis essent prælati, gloriam tamen hanc sibi ipsis non vindicarunt, sed Jacobum Justum Hierosolymorum episcopum constituerunt." The Greek word '*ἱστορουσι*, translated *scribunt*, and thence by Dr. Cook, '*they write*,' does not express exclusively a *written* transmission of narrative; although it does designate authentic narrative as distinguished from report.—The whole passage runs thus in the original: *Τοῦτον δὴ οὖν αὐτὸν Ἰάκωβον, ὃν καὶ δίκαιον ἐπίκλην οἱ πάλαι δι' ἀρετῆς ἐκάλουν προτερήματα, πρῶτον* 'ΙΣΤΟΡΟΥΣΙ *τῆς ἐν* 'Ἱεροσολύμοις *ἐκκλησίας τὸν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς ἐγχειρισθῆναι θρόνον. Κλήμης δὲ ἐν ἕκτῳ τῶν ὑποτυπώσεων* ΓΡΑΦΩΝ *ὧδε παρίστησι.* „*Πέτρον γάρ, φησί, καὶ Ἰάκωβον καὶ Ἰωάννην μετὰ τὴν ἀνάληψιν τοῦ σωτῆρος, ὡς ἂν καὶ ὑπὸ του κυρίου προτετιμημένους, μὴ ἐπιδικάζεσθαι δόξης, ἀλλ' Ἰάκωβον τὸν δίκαιον ἐπίσκοπον Ἱεροσολύμων ἑλέσθαι.* EUS. *Hist. Eccl.* Tom. I. p. 93. ed. F. A. Heinichen.]

m *Eccles. Hist.* Book V. chap. vi.

Digitized by Google

his doctrine with the same propriety that he has done so with many others. But although he has not, on this ground, claimed Eusebius as 'also in his favour,' he has said that 'he has never met with a syllable in Eusebius' to 'inform us what *kind of difference* there was between the *Bishops and Presbyters* of his day,' or 'that the former was a different *order* from the latter:' and he asserts that, 'All that can be gathered from him is, that there were persons called *Bishops* in the days of the Apostles; that there had been a succession of *Bishops* in the Church from the Apostles to the fourth century, when he lived; and that in *his day* there was a distinction between Bishops and Presbyters.'[n] How far Dr. Miller is authorized to say these things, the reader may judge from the following passages from Eusebius.

329. Having said a great deal about the inhuman persecution and unspeakable sufferings of the Christians of Lyons, &c., Eusebius says, "But the same martyrs likewise recommended Irenæus, *then a Presbyter of the Church of Lyons*, to the before mentioned Bishop of Rome, having given him strong commendation, as their words running in this manner, declare," &c. He is also called a Presbyter in the letter.[o]

330. In the next chapter he says: "When Pothinus, then ninety years of age, was finished together with the rest of the martyrs of Gaul, *Irenæus succeeded in the bishopric* of the Parish of Lyons, which Pothinus had ruled." This was in the latter half of the second century.

331. "But Serapion being dead, Asclepiades received the bishopric of the Church at Antioch, who had persevered in confessing (CHRIST) in a time of persecution. Alexander (who was Bishop of Jerusalem) writing to the people of Antioch, makes mention of his *ordination* after this manner," &c. "But these letters I send you, my masters and brethren, by the blessed Presbyter Clement," &c.[p]

332. "But that was the tenth year of the above mentioned reign, in which Origen going to Cæsarea, having left Alexandria, delivered the office of catechizing there to Heraclas. But a little afterwards indeed Demetrius, Bishop of the Church of Alexandria, dies, when he had continued forty-three entire years in the office. But Heraclas succeeded him."[q]

333. "In those times, the necessity of ecclesiastical affairs requiring it, Origen being sent to Greece received in Cæsarea of Palestine the grade of Presbyter (πρεσβυτεριου χειροθεσιαν,) from the Bishops of that place."[r]

In another chapter the same thing is related more fully, and it is stated that this was done by the Bishop of Cæsarea and the Bishop of Jerusalem. Origen was at that time engaged in catechizing, in the Church of Alexandria, to which he belonged; an employment conferred on him by Demetrius his Bishop, who took great offence at those Bishops for having interfered with his Church, and promoted one who was under his government, without his knowledge.[s]

---

n MILLER'S *Letters*, p. 196, [p. 128, 2d *ed.*] italics as in his book.
o *Eccles. Hist.* Book V. Chap. iv.
p *Ibid.* Book VI. Chap. xi.
q *Ibid.* Chap. xxvi.
r *Ibid.* Chap. xxiii.
s *Ibid.* Chap. viii.

Digitized by Google

"And at Alexandria, when Heraclas took upon him the ecclesiastical office after Demetrius, Dionysius succeeded him in the school of instruction, (in catechizing, *see above*,) who was himself one of the scholars (or disciples) of Origen."[t]

"But that was the third year of the reign of Philip, in which Dionysius succeeded Heraclas, (he) having executed the ecclesiastical office for sixteen years."[u]

334. "His fourth epistle concerning baptism was written to Dionysius the Roman, then indeed bearing the office of Presbyter, but a little afterwards having likewise obtained the episcopate," &c.[v]

This was written by Dionysius, Bishop of Alexandria. In his account of the treatment he and others met with during the persecution in his time, he says:

"I went to Æmilianus (the Præfect of Egypt) not alone; but *my Presbyter* Maximus, and the Deacons Faustus, Eusebius, and Chæremon accompanied me; and likewise one of the Roman brethren who were then here (in Alexandria) went with us." And again, "But in the city to which he was exiled, in Libya,) were concealed brethren privately visiting (us); of the Presbyters, Maximus, Dioscorus, Demetrius, and Lucius; (for they who may be considered more illustrious in the world, Faustinus and Aquila, wandered about in Egypt:) but of the Deacons, besides those who perished by disease, there were remaining Faustus, Eusebius, Chæremon." "But it it must be known that this Eusebius, who he says was a Deacon, a little afterwards was appointed Bishop of Laodicea of Syria: but Maximus, who he says was a Presbyter, received the ministry of the Alexandrian Brethren after Dionysius himself; but Faustus, who then stood firm with him in confession, was preserved even until this persecution of our time, now an old man and full of days, was made an end of among us, in martyrdom, by beheading."[w]

335. An accusation having been brought against Narcissus, Bishop of Jerusalem, although nobody in the Church believed it, he retired and spent many years in solitude. "After his departure, when it was entirely unknown where he lived, the Presidents of the neighbouring Churches ordained another Bishop."[x]

336. "But Timæus presided over the episcopate of Antioch after Domnus, whom Cyrillus succeeded in our time; under whom we knew Dorotheus then a Presbyter of the Church of Antioch, an accomplished man."[y]

Speaking of Anatolius, Bishop of Laodicea, Eusebius says:

"Theotecnus, Bishop of Cæsarea Palestine, first laid hands on him for the episcopate," &c. —— "But Agapius succeeded Theotecnus after he had most carefully executed the office of Bishop of Cæsarea Palestine, whom *we know* likewise to have laboured much, and to have presided over the people with most sincere watchfulness, and to have taken care of all with a bountiful hand, especially of the poor. In his time *we knew* Pamphilius, a most learned man, and in his life a true Philosopher, who bore the office of Presbyter of that Church, who, if we were to say what he was and whence he sprung, would require no small discourse." —— "He was indeed at that time most famous. But of those whom we have known most excellent amongst us, *among the Alexandrine Presbyters* was Pierius, *among the*

t *Eccles. Hist.* Book VI. Chap. xxix.
u *Ibid.* Chap. xxxv.
v *Ibid.* Book VII. Chap. vii.
w *Ibid.* Chap. xi.
x *Ibid.* Book VI. Chap. x.
y *Ibid.* Book VII. Chap. xxxii.

Digitized by Google

Bishops Meletius of Pontus." —— "And at Alexandria Theonas succeeded Maximus, who was Bishop thirteen years after Dionysius, under whom at Alexandria, Achillas bore the office of Presbyter together with Pierius."[z]

337. One more very striking passage on several accounts follows; which is taken from the third book of Eusebius's *Life of the Emperor Constantine.* To settle the dispute about the feast of Easter, which had divided the Church into two great parties for above a century, Constantine (that 'truly most excellent and admirable Emperor,' as he is called by the Swiss Reformer Wolfgangus Musculus, who translated Eusebius's history into Latin,) called the Nicene Council: in his account of which Eusebius writes in the following manner:

"Therefore as if about to lead the troop of God upon an expedition, he collected an Œcumenical Council, and called together the Bishops by honorary letters, that they might hasten together from all sides. This was not a simple and inefficacious edict, but the desire of the Emperor co-operated likewise with it in reality, who abundantly supplied to some the convenience of a public journey, to others the service of horses. A city was also appointed, convenient for a Synod, which, situated in Bithynia, is called by a name taken from the Nicæan victory. When, therefore, this edict had reached every one, in a little time all, as from some close prison, assembled with all eagerness of mind. For a certain hope of good, and the communication of peace and of the strange miracle *viz.* the favourable regard of so great an Emperor, drew them. All, therefore, having assembled, now the work of God, which was done, was perceived. For, they who were very far distant from one another not only in mind, but in body, and country, and place, and nation, were collected together, and one city received all, like a crown of priests, made of pleasant flowers. The heads of all the Churches through all Europe, Libya, and Asia, and *of the ministers of* God (*τῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ λειτουργῶν τα ακροθίνια*) were gathered into one. Then the house of oratory, as if divinely enlarged, received within it at once Syrians, Cilicians, Phœnicians, Arabs, Palestines, besides likewise Thebans, Libyans, and those who had come from Mesopotamia. There was present likewise in that Synod a Bishop from Persia, nor was Scythia wanting in this assembly. And Pontus and Galatia, and Pamphylia, and Cappadocia, and Asia, and Phrygia, sent what choice ones they had. But likewise Thracians, and Macedonians, and Achæans, and Epirots, and those who were even further off than these, met together. And of the many sitting together, there was one greatly celebrated Bishop from Spain. *But the Bishop of the Roman city was absent, on account of old age, but his Presbyters being present supplied his place.* Such a crown the Emperor Constantine alone, from the year of peace, has bound together for Christ, and made a worthy (or suitable) return of thanks to his Saviour for victory over opponents and enemies, and appointed for us this image of the apostolic company. For the Scripture teaches that in their times pious men had assembled from every nation which is under heaven, among whom were Parthians, Medes, Elamites, dwellers in Mesopotamia, Judæa, Cappadocia, Pontus, Asia, Phrygia, Pamphylia, Egypt, and the parts of Libya about Cyrene, and strangers of Rome, Jews and Proselytes, Cretes and Arabians. But in this present assembly *there was a multitude of Bishops,* exceeding the number two hundred and fifty; but *the number of Presbyters and Deacons adhering to them* (or their adherents) and of acolyths and very many others, could not indeed be found out."

---

z *Eccles. Hist.* Book VII. Chap. xxxii.

Digitized by Google

338. A comparison of these passages with Dr. Miller's assertions renders it evident at once that the former are directly opposed to the latter.

339. In making the comparison, a clear idea of the question in debate should be kept in view.

The Presbyterian doctrine is, that there is but one order of ministers in the Church, and that Bishops and Presbyters are the same—and constitute that one order.

The Episcopalian doctrine is, that there are three orders of ministers, Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons; the Bishop having authority over the others, who receive their ministerial authority from him.

340. In the passages just recited from Eusebius, who is quoted by Dr. Miller as above mentioned, (§303, 309, 310, 328) the inferiority of the Presbyter is plainly shown.

341. There is but one Bishop in a Church. In the many hundred instances which Eusebius relates of Bishops being ordained to office, there is no case in which it is not obvious that he was the only Bishop in that Church, (§330, 331, 332, 333 to 336;) except only in one, in which the Bishop being more than one hundred and fifty years of age took to himself an adjunct to assist him.[a]

342. The Presbyters were numerous in proportion to the size of the Church: (§329 compared with §151, 334, 336, 337.)

343. There was a plain and marked distinction between them continually made: (§329 compared with §330, 331, 333, 334, 336, 337.)

344. The Bishops administered the government of the Church: (§330, 332, 333, 336.)

345. The Bishops were superior to the Presbyters, (§330, 331, 333, 334;) and had control over them, (§333.) *The Bishops are called the heads of the ministers of* God, as well as of the Churches: (§337.) The Presbyters and Deacons are called *their adherents:* (§337.) The Presbyters had no seat in Councils as principals, but might sit as representatives of their Bishop: for, the Bishop of Rome, being unable through age to attend the Council of Nice, was represented by *his Presbyters:* (§337.)

346. There was an ordination to the office of Presbyter, which indeed need not be proved: (§333.)

347. There was an ordination to the office of Bishop: (§331, 335, 336.)

348. *Bishops ordained both Presbyters and Bishops:* (§33, 335, 336.)

349. There is not a syllable of ordination performed by Presbyters, in Eusebius nor in any other author consulted as far as I have been able to discover up to his time; and there is no case I believe, even alleged by our opponents. See also on these sev-

a *Eccles. Hist.* Book VI. Chap. x. xi..

Digitized by Google

eral points, (§341 to 349,) the following Sections, §130, 153, 154, 183, 185 191 to 195, 201, 202, 203, 205, 206, 209, 241, 242, 247, &c., 252, 282, and all the passages in italics in the Epistles of Ignatius.

350. Eusebius mentions the succession to the episcopate, in the different Churches of Europe, Asia, and Africa, of a very great number of persons; together with an infinite variety of circumstances, transactions, controversies; and yet there is not a single expression at variance with what is stated above, (§341 to 349,) as far as I have seen; and I have looked through most of the books, by the index, in order to discover passages in which these subjects are mentioned.

351. Unquestionably, then, there is complete evidence that the government of the Church was episcopal in the time of the Council of Nice, *viz.* in the year 325. And if we inquire when it was otherwise, the answer must be, never.

352. Was it otherwise in the time of Cyprian? No. For although he was in the habit of consulting his Presbyters on all important occasions, it was because he thought proper to do so.—"Statui apud me," &c. according to Bishop Taylor.[b] 'I have resolved with myself *to consult you*,' were his words. And notwithstanding this resolution, (which the very words show was a matter in which he might do as he pleased,) when, in his absence, his Presbyters received those who had lapsed in the persecution, on what he considered insufficient evidence of their repentance, and without consulting him, he reversed their decision, put out of the Church those whom the Presbyters had received, and told them when he should return that they should have a fair hearing before him. See Sections 153, 188, 191 to 195, 200 to 203, 241, 242, 252, all of which relate to his time.

The government of the Church was, therefore, certainly episcopal in the time of Cyprian, *viz.* about the year 250.

353. Was it otherwise in the time of Origen? This great and most learned man, whose lectures were attended even by the Heathen philosophers, lived four years after Cyprian became Bishop of Carthage and Dionysius Bishop of Alexandria. That the government of the Church under Cyprian and Dionysius was episcopal, we have already seen, (§334, 352.) Dionysius succeeded Heraclas, first as Principal of the catechetic school at Alexandria, and, at his death, as Bishop. Heraclas succeeded Demetrius in the bishopric. Origen was under all three of these Bishops in succession. The first had appointed him, when he was very young, principal of the catechetic school. While absent on some occasion from Alexandria, two Bishops ordained him Presbyter, at which interference with those under his authority, Demetrius took great offence: (§333.) These Bishops were so much pleased with Origen, that they caused him to preach and explain the Scriptures when they were present,

b *Works*, Vol. VII. p. 225.

Digitized by Google

choosing rather to hear him than to preach themselves. Hearing this, Demetrius issued an order to him to return to Alexandria, and he obeyed.[c] These things show that Demetrius exercised the same authority that Dionysius and Cyprian had done, (§352;) and that the government of the Church was the same in the youth as in the old age of Origen. Demetrius was made Bishop of Alexandria in the tenth year of the Emperor Commodus;[d] *viz.* in the year 190, in the time of Irenæus and Tertullian.

354. But what do they say? Irenæus writes that the Roman Bishops succeeded one by one in the government, one Bishop only at a time being in the Church in this immense capital of the civilized world; that Paul and Peter themselves delivered the government of the Church to Linus the first of the series; and that this is given as an example of what took place *in every Church which was in all respects faithful*, the Apostles having appointed Bishops in all the Churches: (§130.) Tertullian's testimony agrees entirely with this; (§185,) and the testimony of both is confirmed by Eusebius's very particular mention of the accession of the successive Bishops to the episcopate, in a number of the principal Churches, as Rome, Alexandria, Jerusalem, Antioch, Ephesus, with the time, and circumstances in very many instances; drawn from the records of the different Churches, consisting of controversial writings between Christians and heretics, Christians and heathens, and different parties of Christians; and of numberless Epistles of all the principal men in the Church in every part of Christendom, from the beginning; of all which Eusebius cites an immense number, and quotes books now lost.

355. Irenæus was born in 97, and Polycarp suffered martyrdom in 148; so that the former was full fifty years of age when the latter was put to death. Irenæus says that *he had seen Polycarp, who was not only taught by the Apostles and conversed with many of those who had seen our* LORD, *but was likewise appointed by the Apostles Bishop in that Church which is at Smyrna in Asia*, (§130.) He mentions his most glorious martyrdom, and his 'most excellent Epistle' to the Philippians, still extant, 'from which,' he says, 'they who wish and have regard for their own salvation, can learn the character of his faith and the doctrine of the truth,' (§130.) In this Epistle Polycarp speaks in the strongest terms of the Epistles of Ignatius, all of which it may be observed, are mentioned by Eusebius by name, except that to the Romans, and from that one he has a passage quoted;[e] Polycarp, in his Epistle to the Philippians, mentioned by Irenæus, says of the Epistles of Ignatius, they 'are subjoined to this Epistle, by which you may be greatly

c CAVE'S *Lives*, Vol. II. p. 396.
d EUSEB. *Eccles. Hist.* Book V. Chap. xxii.
e *Eccles. Hist.* Book III. Chap. xxxvi.

Digitized by Google

profited; for they treat of faith and patience, and of all things that pertain to edification in the LORD JESUS.' (§126.) These strong expressions of high regard and esteem, bind these ancient servants of GOD so entirely together, that it is impossible to separate them and their testimony as to the matter of fact, the form of government of the Church in their day.

356. The public life of the three embraces the whole period from the time of Paul and Peter until the close of the second century. Polycarp and Ignatius, both acquainted with the Apostles,[f] (§117, 125, 130,) were contemporary from their day until the martyrdom of the latter in the very beginning of the second century, about a dozen years after the death of St. John. Polycarp and Irenæus were contemporary from that time until the martyrdom of the latter in 148; and Irenæus continued until the end of the second century, indeed until 202.

Irenæus speaking of Polycarp in the strongest terms of approbation, and specifying a particular Epistle of his, in which Ignatius' Epistles are as strongly commended, adds his testimony to that of Polycarp in favour of the Epistles of Ignatius. The latter, therefore, give us a just representation of the government of the Church throughout the whole period, from the days of the Apostles to the end of the second century.

357. What is the period fixed upon by those who assert that there was a time in this century when the government was other than episcopal? The most learned Presbyterian writers, Blondel, &c. and the Presbyterian Assembly in London in the seventeenth century, (who met to settle their Church in England,) (§162) have fixed upon the year 140. If so, it must have been eight years before the martyrdom of Polycarp, who suffered in 148, some say later.

The attachment of Polycarp to the Church was gloriously evinced, as Irenæus says, by his death. His whole life showed it no less, and secured to him the unbounded regard of the whole Christian world, (§130.) So fundamental a change as that from a presbyterian to an episcopal form of government, originating, as is represented, in the pride and ambition of aspiring priests, never could have been approved of by him; much less could he have been partaker of their ambitious views. His character forbids the thought, (§130;) and yet his high approbation of the Epistles of Ignatius shows that he had no idea of any other than the episcopal form of government. It is, moreover, to be remembered that this approbation was expressed at the time of Ignatius' death, after he had left Smyrna on his way to Rome, and

---

f EUSEBIUS quotes a passage from IGNATIUS' *Epistle to the Smyrneans*, in which he says he saw our SAVIOUR: "Ἐγὼ δὲ καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἐν σαρκὶ αὐτὸν ΟΙΔΑ," &c. (*Eccles. Hist.* Book III. Chap. xxxvi.) "But *I knew* him in the flesh even after the resurrection," &c. See the passage in the Appendix, Section 3 of the Epistle to the Smyrneans, which, after the word *flesh*, is exactly translated. It may be mentioned here that Eusebius' quotation from the Epistle of Ignatius to the Romans and the translation in the Appendix, Section 5, agree entirely.

Digitized by Google

before Polycarp had yet heard the event. For in his Epistle to the Philippians, he desires them, if they have heard certainly of the event of Ignatius' journey, to inform him. This was in the year in which Syra and Senecius were a second time consuls, according to the account of his martyrdom kept by his friends;[g] which was, according to the Roman Consular lists, in the year 107; or if we take into account their serving together a part of a year, in consequence of the death of the Emperor Nerva who was that year consul, the second time that Sura and Senecius were consuls together was in the year 102. According to Tacitus, however, the martyrdom of Ignatius occurred in the year in which Trajan went to Antioch, *viz.* in the year 113.[h] At the latest it was thirty-five years before the martyrdom of Polycarp, and twenty-seven years before the time fixed upon by the Presbyterian writers as the commencement of episcopacy. The great regard expressed for Ignatius,[i] and the strong desire manifested by the Churches of Asia to procure his Epistles, (§126) and the open and unreserved manner in which he writes and Polycarp approves, manifest in all of them the most perfect consciousness, that there was nothing in those Epistles contrary to the doctrine and practice of the Apostles, which was perfectly well known to the whole Church at that day; there being then, in every part of the world which the Apostles had visited, thousands still living who had heard them and knew their mode of regulating the Churches, and hundreds, perhaps thousands, whom they had actually ordained. Clement, whom Paul calls his fellow-labourer, συνεργος,[k] was then Bishop of Rome. He died in the third year of the reign of Trajan; in the beginning of which St. John was still living;[l] and in the fourth, or ninth, or by Tacitus' account, in the fifteenth year of the same reign Ignatius was put to death, as above mentioned. Such men, so living and so dying, could not have assented to the total subversion of the apostolic plan of governing the Church; nor could they have so completely effected it within so few years of the days of the Apostles, as to leave no trace of a revolution, nor any allusion to it in their Epistles. Nor could it have been in so short a time so universally received, that there is not a trace of a revolution in the voluminous writings of Irenæus and Tertullian, expressly devoted to contending against all changes of the doctrine and tradition of the Apostles, (§186.) Such a change as this throughout the world could not possibly have been made without opposition from somebody. Some friend of the apostolic institutions, the aggrieved Presbyters who had been appointed by them, or some intrepid spirit indignant at the ambition of the usurpers,

---

g See the *Martyrdom* in the Appendix, Section 13.

h *Appendice Chronologica* Trajano xci.

i See *Martyrdom*, and POLYCARP'S *Epistle*, in Section 126.

k Philip. iv. 3; see §209, note.

l EUSEB. *Eccles. Hist.* Book III. Chap. xxi. xxii. first lines of Chap. xxiii. and xxxiv.

Digitized by Google

would surely have spoken out. Or, if all these had been silent, the enemies of the Church, who ran into heretical notions from the very commencement, and departed or were driven from her bosom, would have reproached the Church with its departure from first principles, in order to countenance or excuse their own. But though challenged (§185) they are silent, there being, as far as I know, nothing of the kind. There is no trace of such a change, and therefore it never occurred; and consequently the form of government was episcopal from the beginning.

358. The Church in every part of the world continued in this state until the time of Calvin, a period of fifteen hundred years. In his day a new system was introduced into some parts of Europe, which excluded the episcopal order, as well as that of the Deacons, and the whole authority, including the power of ordaining successors, was assumed by Presbyters.

359. What the ancient Church thought of ordination by Presbyters may be gathered from the following statements.

360. In the fourth century Colluthus a Presbyter, ordained Ischiras to that office. Ischiras was reduced to lay communion by the Synod of Alexandria; and in the Synodical Epistle of the Bishops of Egypt, Thebais, Libya, and Pentapolis, and in the joint letter of the clergy of the province of Mareotis, both preserved in the works of Athanasius, it is declared that *the ordination was null, because it was performed by a Presbyter.*

361. Maximus, another Presbyter in the same century, ordained some persons to the same office, and all his ordinations were pronounced null and void by the council of Constantinople.[m]

362. In the same century Aerius maintained that Presbyters were equal to Bishops, and had a right to ordain: for which and some other doctrines he was condemned as a heretic.[n]

363. In the fifth century, Musæus and Eutychianus ordained some clerks, themselves not being Bishops. The council of Sardis refused to consider them as clergymen, because they were not 'ordained by them who were Bishops verily and indeed.'

364. The following is yet a stronger case than the preceding. The Bishop of Agabra being blind, his Presbyters read the words of ordination while he laid his hands upon the candidate. This ordination was pronounced invalid by the first council of Seville. "These cases are so known," says Bishop Taylor, "I need not insist on them."[o]

365. Before the fourth century, such a thing does not appear to have been thought of. For Novatus, a Presbyter, having determined to form a separate Church, in order to obtain the power of ordaining, which was indispensable to his success, because without it he could have no successors, inveigled three

m For both these cases see BOWDEN, Vol. I. p. 49, 51; [Vol. I. p. 25, 26, 2d *ed.*] and TAYLOR'S *Works*, Vol. VII. p. 132.

n EPIPHANIUS, *Heresy* 75; TAYLOR'S *Works*, Vol. VII. p. 127.

o See TAYLOR'S *Works*, Vol. VII. p. 132, for both these.

Digitized by Google

Bishops from a distant part of the country into his house, and forced them to ordain him, (§252.) If Presbyters really had the power of ordaining from the commencement, and had only been deprived of it for a short time, (for Novatus lived in the middle of the third century,) why did he not claim his ancient right, instead of resorting to fraud and violence to obtain one? Why not exercise the right already in him, seeing that he could not derive from an act of violence and fraud, a claim better in reality, or as likely to be assented to by those whom he hoped to influence?

366. The cases stated above show in the plainest manner the sense of the ancient Church upon the subject of ordination by Presbyters. What the views of the Church were in after ages, may be gathered from the following account. In the seventeenth century the Bohemian Church suffered so severe a persecution, that one Bishop only survived. Commenius, the only surviving Bishop, 'that they might fully satisfy the scruples, as well of their own consciences, as of others,' sent three Presbyters, one of whom had been ordained by the Bishop of Rome, to the Waldenses dwelling in Austria and Moravia, to receive episcopal ordination; and they were ordained by the Bishops of the Waldenses.[p] In truth, as far as I have had it in my power to examine the books quoted in the preceding pages, I can find but one case (excepting those which are mentioned and which were immediately declared null and void,) in which a Presbyter laid on hands in ordination, and in that case two Bishops officiated. I therefore am driven to the conclusion, that Presbyters have no authority to ordain.

367. I am well aware that this opinion is offensive to those who have no other than presbyterian ordination. But truth is what we ought all to seek; particularly in so essential a concern as that of the true ministry of the Church of CHRIST. There is no one thing more frequently urged on Christians, than the obligation to 'flee divisions,' to 'speak the same things;' and how is this to be done but by a fair and candid discussion of points on which we disagree? No one then has a right to complain that his opinion is questioned. Every one who is of a right spirit would rejoice to have the truth clearly made out and embraced by all.

368. This question is the more important, because if the conclusion we have drawn be just, all other than episcopal ordination is necessarily invalid. This declaration, although it follows as necessarily from the premises as the conclusion of any proposition ever stated, has been reprobated in the strongest terms, because it involves an exclusive claim to the ministry. It is however far from being the desire of those who believe that episcopal ordination alone is valid, to prevent any qualified per-

---

p BOWDEN, Vol. II. p. 79, Vol. III. p. 332, 342, [Vol. I. p. 223, Vol. II. p. 162 a. 2d ed.] who quotes the *Book of Discipline of the Bohemian Church, &c.*

Digitized by Google

son from entering into the ministry. They only wish to convince those who believe themselves called to minister in holy things, and who are, from early prejudice, or misinformation, or not investigating the subject, content with authority derived from Presbyters, that this authority is not valid, and to induce them to obtain that which is. The doctrine ought not to be rejected because it involves an exclusive claim; for, there must necessarily be a right in the truly authorized, to the exclusion of those who are not; and the question at issue ought to rest on its merits.

369. But how does this matter concern private Christians, if they are truly religious? and why should a man leave the Church to which he has been attached, when the ministers are good, religious men? These singular questions have been frequently urged, with great earnestness, upon myself. But few words however are sufficient to show their absurdity. We are commanded to be baptized, and to receive the sacrament in memory of our LORD. We cannot obey these injunctions in sincerity unless we are satisfied of the validity of the authority of the minister; and to receive these mysteries at the hands of those we are persuaded are not authorized, is a profanity *in us;* though it may not be *in them who minister*, *provided* they are conscientiously persuaded of their authority *after full investigation of the subject.* But this *proviso* includes a great deal more than may be supposed at first view. A man who makes up his mind from reading an ordination sermon, and does not even take the trouble to see that the quotations are correctly made, although he has spent years in learning the classical languages for the very purpose, avowedly, of fully informing himself on all doctrinal points, cannot pretend to have a clear conscience in this matter. And if it be urged that the authors quoted are rare and not easily to be met with, it is answered; first, that a man's duty is to inform himself, and not to talk of the difficulty of doing it:—secondly, there are libraries in almost every part of the country where these books may be consulted, and a few days' ride is no object when we desire to ascertain our title to so important an office:—thirdly, those who have studied regularly for years in public institutions in which these books are to be found, and have not thoroughly examined them, are without even a colour of excuse.

370. But what necessity for leaving the Methodist Episcopal Church? Professing with all sincerity very high esteem and affectionate regard for a number of the ministers of that Society, I must nevertheless say, because their ordination is only presbyterian. Mr. Wesley was no more than a Presbyter, and therefore had no authority to ordain; much less to ordain a Bishop.

371. In this respect he and Calvin stand upon the same ground precisely. It is certain that a man cannot have that which was never given to him, except it be something belonging to him by nature. To neither of the above was authority to ordain ever

Digitized by Google

given. The Bishops who ordained them, did not intend to confer such power. They did not at the time consider themselves as receiving such power; and if they had been questioned immediately afterwards they would not have pretended that it was conferred upon them. Most assuredly then it was not given to them: therefore, they had it not. To argue that they possessed the power of ordination because it originally belonged to Presbyters, is to argue that they *to whom it was not given* possessed the power, because it belonged *to them to whom it was given.* Even allowing that the ancient Presbyters had power given them to ordain others, it would only afford to modern Presbyters ground to complain that the authority they ought to have was withheld from them; but none to say that the power withheld was given to them. To *have a right* to a power is not the same as *possessing* that power. It is plain that the consent of the grantor is necessary to a grant. A forced consent is bad enough, as in the case of the Bishops who ordained Novatus, (§252;) but where there is no consent and no intention to give on the one part, and on the other no expectation of receiving, and no belief at the time of having received, but the contrary, the very idea of a grant is absurd.

372. If it be alleged that they had the power because it is essential to the character of a Presbyter; it is replied, if it be essential, then were they not Presbyters. For what made them such? The ordination of the Bishop, whereby the authority of exercising the office and duties of a Presbyter was conveyed to them. And if an essential power was not conveyed, they were not made Presbyters. It was a capital defect.

373. To assume powers, at the time admitted not to be granted, and peremptorily denied by all but the person desirous of exercising them, by virtue of an argument founded upon a construction of some passages of Scripture, in opposition to the declared sense of the Church, and to its admitted doctrine and practice for fourteen hundred years before, is to open a wide door to innovation.

374. Suppose that a Ruling Elder in a Presbyterian Church should deny the existence of any scriptural distinction between ruling and preaching Elders—as he very well might—and therefore, assert that he had a right to preach; how would the Presbyterians answer him? The only proper answer would be, 'We did not intend in making you a Ruling Elder to give you authority to preach; you knew when we appointed you that we did not; you did not at the time conceive that you were receiving such authority, but promised to act in subordination to the minister; you are now setting up a claim to authority, because you think it *ought* to have been conferred on you; and this opinion is founded on your construction of a passage of Scripture contrary to the practice of the Church you belong to.' 'But this argument,' the Ruling Elder might reply, 'operates as completely against your claim to ordination, as it does against mine

Digitized by Google

to preaching. You also rest your claim on your own construction of a passage of Scripture. Therefore give up your own, or admit mine.'

375. Mr. Wesley, therefore, not having received power to ordain, his ordination of Dr. Coke was without effect. Moreover, as Mr. Wesley's claim to this power rests on the doctrine of the sameness of the Bishop and Presbyter, Dr. Coke being a Presbyter, was, if that doctrine be true, a Bishop without the ordination of Mr. Wesley. From this, therefore, Dr. Coke received nothing. Consequently he came to America a Presbyter, and Presbyterian ordination was all he had in his power to confer. Moreover, as all the authority he had arose out of his office of Presbyter, and as he had that independently of Mr. Wesley, it follows that *he* is the true source of the ordination of the Methodist ministers.

376. Mr. Wesley professes in his letter to Dr. Coke, Mr. Asbury, &c. of 1784, to have founded his belief of the sameness of the office of Presbyter and Bishop on the argument of LORD KING in his *Inquiry into the Constitution, &c. of the Primitive Church.*

377. It is not proposed to enter fully into an examination of this work, which fell into my hands after this Essay was drawing to a close; but only to point out some fundamental errors into which the author fell in his investigation, which destroy entirely the whole system built upon them.

378. Lord King's plan is to show, 1. That there was but one Bishop to a Church.[q]

2. That there was but one Church to a Bishop.[r]

3. That that Church was what we now call a parish;[s] from which he infers,[t] that "a Bishop having but one parish under his jurisdiction, could extend his government no further than a single congregation; because a single congregation and a parish were all one, of the same bulk and magnitude;" and this inference he endeavours to support at some length.

4. After concluding his argument on these points, he inquires into the nature of the office of a Presbyter, and endeavours to show that he is "a person in holy orders, having thereby an inherent right to perform the whole office of a Bishop; but being possessed of no place or parish, nor actually discharging it, without the permission and consent of the Bishop of a place or parish."[u]

379. To the first proposition no objection can be made. All antiquity is plain upon that point: and he considers it, for that reason, certain, notwithstanding that he had difficulties arising out of the application of the term Bishop to Presbyters in the Scripture; and notwithstanding "that Clemens Romanus (he says) mentions many in one Church."[v]

---

q Pages 11 to 14. r Page 15. s Page 16 t Page 17.
u Page 53. v Page 11.

Digitized by Google

380. But with regard to the Scriptures, it is evident from what has been already shown that they had not in view the same persons that the fathers had, (§101.) The Scriptures mention many *Bishops* in a Church because they applied that term to the *Presbyters*, they being then the *overseers* of the flock in consequence of the itinerant life of the Apostles, who were the real governors of the Churches; (§274) as Paul in Ephesus during his three years residence there, and Timothy after him for an unlimited period; and James the Just in Jerusalem, who, Jerome as well as Clement (§326) asserts, was ordained Bishop of Jerusalem by the Apostles.[w]

381. Scripture therefore does not stand in the way of Lord King's conclusion, that there is but one Bishop in a city. The Presbyters were always subordinate to the Apostles even when itinerant and absent, (§274) and to those whom they set over them; as Timothy and Titus, &c. one only being in a Church at a time: and the identity of the office and the power of the Apostles and the Bishop, are shown by Timothy's exercising every power over the Presbyters, after Paul's departure, that he had exercised over them; and by the application of the term Apostle to such as occupied Timothy's place by Paul himself, (§45;) and by the application of the term Bishop to the same persons immediately after the death of the Apostles, by those who knew them; and by the use of both terms as synonymous, by some of the most devoted, and most exemplary men who ever ministered in holy things. Cyprian for instance—who was a man of learning, talents, eminence, and fortune, and sacrificed all, giving up his whole property to the Church, and finally his life in martyrdom, rather than deny his SAVIOUR and return to the world which was ready to receive him and honour him—Cyprian says, "The Deacons ought to remember, that the LORD chose the Apostles, *that is, the Bishops and Governors*."[x]

382. Neither is the passage Lord King has quoted from Clemens Romanus an obstacle to his conclusion, that there was but one Bishop to a Church; a conclusion to which he admits he was driven by the united voice of the early fathers.[y] The words of Clemens quoted by him are, "Ὑποτασσόμενοι τοῖς ἡγουμένοις ὑμῶν," that is, *Being obedient to those having rule over you*, without specifying any particular person or office. Lord King's idea is that the word ἡγουμένοις, *having rule over*, signifies *Bishop*, because Bishops were they who ruled the Churches. But although this

w The following is quoted from JEROME by HOOKER, Vol. II. p. 242. "Jacobus, qui appellatur frater Domini, cognomento Justus, post Passionem Domini statim ab Apostolis Hierosolymorum episcopus ordinatus est." (HIERON. *Script. Eccles. Catal.* ii.)—that is, James, who is called the brother of the LORD, surnamed the Just, immediately after the passion of the LORD was ordained Bishop of Jerusalem by the Apostles."

x "Meminisse Diaconi debent, quoniam Apostolos, *id. est, Episcopos et Præpositos*, DOMINUS elegit." CYPRIAN Lib. III. *Ep.* 9. (al. *Ep.* 3. c. 2.) quoted by HOOKER, Vol. II. p. 241, note.

y Page 11.

Digitized by Google

is true; yet the Presbyters had a subordinate authority, and under the direction of the Bishop aided in ruling the Church, (§183, 275.) The word ἡγουμένοις, therefore, includes *the Presbyters* as well as the Bishop, and the plural is used without implying that there was more than one Bishop in the Church. Clement therefore does not say any thing contrary to the rest of the fathers; and Lord King's conclusion, that there was but one Bishop in a Church, stands without an objection.

383. The next step of this author is to show, that there was but one Church to a Bishop. He says that this word, Church, was "the common name whereby a Bishop's cure was denominated, the Bishop himself being usually called, The Bishop of this or that Church; as Tertullian saith, That Polycarp was ordained Bishop of the Church of Smyrna."[z] To this there is no objection to be made. But the question arises, What is a Church?

384. In answer to this question Lord King endeavours to prove, that a "Bishop's Diocese exceeded not the bounds of a modern *parish*, and was the same, as in name, so also in thing."[a] And first as to the name.

385. He says, "As for the word *Diocese*, by which the Bishop's flock is now usually expressed, I do not remember that ever I found it used in this sense by any of the ancients."[b] Socrates, however, who lived in the fourth century, in his account of the Council of Constantinople, says they decreed, That the Bishop of a *Diocese*, διοικήσεις, should not pass (be translated) to another Church.[c] The word occurs twice more within the compass of a page. It is evident from its being used in the wording of a law or canon, that it was common and well understood. The extent of a Diocese will appear presently.

386. Lord King goes on immediately after the words quoted above, (§385) to say,

"But there is another word still retained by us, by which they frequently denominated the Bishop's cure, and that is *Parish*. So in the Synodical Epistle of Irenæus to Pope Victor, the bishopries of Asia are twice called *parishes*. And in Eusebius's *Ecclesiastical History* the word is so applied in several hundred places. It is usual there to read of the Bishops of the *parish* of Alexandria, of the parish of Ephesus, of the parish of Corinth, of the parish of Athens, of the parish of Carthage; and so of the Bishops of the parishes of several other Churches; *by that term denoting the very same that we now call a Parish*, viz. a competent number of Christians dwelling near together, having one Bishop, Pastor, or minister set over them, with whom they all met at one time to worship and serve God."[d]

387. It is admitted that the word παροικια was used by Eusebius to signify the cure of a Bishop. But that 'that term denotes

---

z Page 15. a Page 17. b Page 15.
c SOCRATIS *Eccles. Hist.* Book V. Chap. viii. d *Primitive Church*, p. 15.

Digitized by Google

the very same that we now call a Parish,' &c. is utterly impossible.

388. The word παροικια, translated *parish*, is used by Eusebius as synonymous with εκκλησια, translated *church*; as will appear from a comparison of the following passages.

389. Let the reader look back to the passage respecting James's receiving the bishopric of Jerusalem from the Apostles (§326,) and compare it with the following from the same author.

After the martyrdom of James, a council was held to consider who should succeed him, "and they all, with one and the same opinion, judged Simeon the son of Cleopas, whom the gospel Scripture also mentions, worthy of the seat of *the parish of Jerusalem*."[e]

James first obtained, they write, the episcopal *seat of the Church* at Jerusalem, and Simeon succeeded him in the *seat of the parish* of Jerusalem.

390. "But when Nero had now reigned eight years, Anianus, a pious man, in every respect celebrated, first after Mark, the Apostle and Evangelist, undertook the administration of the Alexandrine parish."[f]

391. "But after Nerva had reigned a little above a year, Trajan succeeded him; in the first year of whose reign, Cerdo succeeded Abilius, who presided over the Alexandrine *parish* thirteen years. He is the third of those who after Anianus presided over the *Church*."[g] Here the two words are used precisely in the same sense.

It is worth observing, as we proceed, that St. John lived until the commencement of the reign of Trajan: that is until Cerdo the fourth Bishop after Mark, succeeded to the bishopric of Alexandria.[h]

392. "The twelfth year of the reign of Trajan was passed, when he being dead, whom a little before we signified to have been Bishop of *the Alexandrine parish*, Primus obtained the ministry of the *same Church* in the fourth place after the Apostles."[i]

Here again these words are used as synonymous.

393. These quotations might easily be multiplied. They plainly show that παροικια was another word for εκκλησια, *Church*; and consequently there is no kind of propriety in saying that the term παροικια denotes the very same that we now call a *parish*. On the contrary, it denotes the very same that the ancient Christians then called a Church.

394. What they meant by *a Church* may easily be gathered from what they say of the Church of Rome, of Alexandria, of Carthage, of Jerusalem, &c.

---

e EUSEBIUS, *Eccles. Hist.* Book III. Ch. xi.
f *Ibid.* Book II. Ch. xxiv.
g *Ibid.* Book III. Ch. xxi.
h *Ibid.* Book III. Ch. xxi. xxiii.
i *Ibid.* Book IV. Ch. i.

Digitized by Google

395. In Jerusalem there were three thousand persons added to the Church on the first day the Gospel was publicly preached after the ascent of our LORD:[k] and when Paul went there from Ephesus there was an innumerable company of Christians. When he went, on his arrival, *to see James, all the Presbyters being present, they said unto him, Thou seest how many* TENS OF THOUSANDS *of the Jews there are which believe.*[l] The words in our translation are, *thou seest how many* THOUSANDS; but in the original it is μυριάδες, MYRIADS, *tens of thousands:* in the fourth chapter above quoted, the word is χιλιάδες, which signifies *thousands.* It is stated that *a great company of the Priests also were obedient to the faith* at an early period.[m]

396. Who, therefore, can believe the representation of Lord King, that THE PARISH OF JERUSALEM *denotes the very same thing that we now call a Parish,* viz. 'a competent number of Christians dwelling near together, having one Bishop, Pastor, or minister set over them, with whom they all met at one time to worship and serve GOD?'[n] Or, that the Bishop of *the parish of Jerusalem,* with its *many myriads of Christians,* had under his government no more than 'a single congregation?'[o] It is very obvious that so many *tens of thousands* of Christians could not be attended to by the Bishop alone, but that he required a number of Presbyters to aid him; and it is very certain that he had them, as is mentioned above; when Paul went to see him, *all the Elders or Presbyters were present.*[p]

397. As to Alexandria, we may judge of the extent of that *parish* by a decree of the Council of Nice, in the year 325. The three preceding decrees relate to Bishops, and this, the sixth, is in these words: "And that at Alexandria, and in the city of Rome, *the ancient custom* should be observed, that the one should have the charge of the Churches of Egypt, and the other of those around the city."[q] This in the year 325 is called *the ancient custom.* See some notice of a number of Presbyters in the Church of Alexandria under Dionysius in Section 334.

398. Carthage in the second century contained a great number of Christians. Tertullian, a native of that city, and a Presbyter of the Church, in his *Address to Scapula,* tells him, that it was a proof of the extraordinary patience of the Christians that they conducted themselves with modesty, and quietly, seeing that they were at that time so "great a multitude of men, almost the major part of every city."[r] We have already seen what a number of Churches there were in that city, and how many

---

k Acts ii. 41; see also ii. 47; iv. 4; v. 14; vi. 1, 7.
l Acts xxi. 18, 20.
m Acts vi. 7.
n LORD KING, p. 16: see §386.
o *Ibid.* p. 17; see §378.
p Acts xxi. 18.
q "VI. Et ut apud Alexandriam, et in urbe Roma, *vetusta consuetudo* servetur, ut vel ille Ægypti, vel hic suburbicariarum ecclesiarum solicitudinem gerat."—RUFFIN. *Hist. Eccles.* Book I. Ch. vi.
r TERTUL. *ad Scap.* cap. ii.

Digitized by Google

Presbyters, (§195.) For what earthly use were those buildings erected, and to what end were those Presbyters ordained, if there was but a single congregation in the *parish* of Carthage, as Lord King asserts? Or, who can believe that by the term *parish*, applied to this great city and multitude of Christians, with numerous buildings for public worship, and a corresponding ample supply of Presbyters, is denoted 'the very same thing that we now call a parish?'

399. Or who can believe that the *parish* of Rome denotes 'the very same that we now call a Parish,' when reminded that Rome contained millions of people, was of vast extent, and had, at a very early period, forty-six Presbyters and seven Deacons, under the control of the Bishop for the service of the Church, which was so large that it contained fifteen hundred widows and afflicted persons to be supported by the charity of the affluent?[s]

400. Let us for one moment consider what would be the size of a building that would contain the people of such a parish as Jerusalem or Rome. *How many* tens of thousands of believers there were in Jerusalem when Paul went there, we cannot exactly say. But it is indisputable that there were *many*. Let us suppose *four* only. Each person occupies about five square feet: forty-thousand persons, therefore, would require two hundred thousand square feet, or a building five hundred feet in length and four hundred in breadth: and this without taking into consideration the crowds of unbelievers who continually attended the preaching of the Gospel, and of whom great numbers *were daily added to the Church*.

401. Notwithstanding the manifest absurdity of this doctrine, Lord King labours to prove that these ancient parishes, of Jerusalem, Rome, &c. 'exceeded not the bounds of a modern parish,' from several considerations.

402. First, he says, "All the people of a diocese did every Sunday meet all together in one place to celebrate divine service."[t] This has been shown to be impossible, and the idea is founded on misapprehension of the meaning of some passages.

403. The first passage he quotes in support of this opinion is from Justin Martyr's *Apology* addressed to the Emperor. "On Sunday all assemble together in one place, where the Bishop preaches and prays."[u] The words of the original, which he also quotes, are πάντων ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συνέλευσις γίνεται: that is, literally, 'there is an assembly (συνέλευσις, *conventus*, *concursus*—*a convention*, *concourse*, or *meeting*) of all together. The words ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ signify *together*; and may, therefore, and do generally, imply the additional words *in one place*, used in the translation of Lord King; but there is no express word for *in one place* in the passage. But when the circumstances of the case render it evident that this concourse or meeting could not have been in one place, from

---

s Euseb. *Eccl. Hist.* Book VI. Chap. xliii. See §242. t Page 17.
u Lord King, p. 17.

Digitized by Google

the multitude, (§400) and the added words are not even necessary to a reasonable construction of the sentence, it is evident that the argument is not to be relied on. Tertullian, in his *Apology* for the persecuted Christians *against the nations*, uses similar language of the whole body of Christians upon the earth. He says, "Coimus in coetum et congregationem, ut ad DEUM quasi manu facta precationibus, ambiamus orantes."[v] That is, "We come together into an assembly or congregation, that we may plead praying to GOD, as if constraining him by prayers." These two fathers were both writing Apologies for the Church at large, both are describing their customs, both are speaking of their meetings, and both use words of precisely similar import. συνερχομαι, in the quotation from Justin, from which συνελευσις is derived, (or of which it is the noun) signifies precisely the same as *coimus* in the quotation from Tertullian.

404. Moreover, Lord King has quoted in another place,[w] a passage from Justin, which shows plainly the incorrectness of translating ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ in this passage, by the words *together in one place;* as well as the impossibility of the persons spoken of, all meeting in one place.

405. The original is as follows. Τῇ τοῦ ἡλίου λεγομένῃ ἡμέρᾳ πάντων κατὰ πόλεις ἢ ἀγρους μενόντων ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συνέλευσις γίνεται. That is, "On Sunday there is a meeting together of all residing *in cities and countries*." It is evident from this use of the plural words *cities* and *countries*, that Justin in this Apology for the Christians, speaks, as Tertullian also does, of the whole body of Christians. But notwithstanding this, Lord King translates these words, πόλεις and ἀγροὺς, manifestly plural, by the words *city* and *country*, in the singular; as follows: "On Sunday all the inhabitants both of *city* and *country* met together."

406. It is remarkable in this last sentence that the words *in one place* are omitted; although the original words are the very same with those which in the first passage are translated *together in one place;* (§403) showing manifestly the justice of the above argument against the use of those words *here*. (§403 to 405.)

407. Indeed this passage appears to be quoted in three different places.

1. It is quoted, Πάντων ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συνέλευσις γίνεται: with a reference to 'Apol. 1. p. 98:' and is translated, *On Sunday all assemble together in one place.*[x]

2. It is quoted, Τῇ τοῦ ἡλίου λεγομένῃ ἡμέρα πάντων ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συνέλευσις γίνεται, with a reference to 'Apol. 2. p. 98.' which is translated, *The Bishop's whole diocese met together on Sunday.*[y]

The only difference between these two sentences is that of the addition of the five words which precede πάντων in the second.—These five words signify *on Sunday;* (literally, *on the day*

---

v TERTUL. *Apol.* cap. XXXIX.
x LORD KING, p. 17.
w *Primitive Church*, p. 42.
y *Ibid.* p. 19.

Digitized by Google

called the Sun's;) and this very addition is found in Lord King's translation of the first. These passages, therefore, appear to be the same.

3. This passage is quoted again in page 42. Τῇ τοῦ ἡλίου λεγομένῃ ἡμέρᾳ πάντων ἑκατὰ πόλεις ἢ ἀγρους μενόντων) ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συνέλευσις γίνεται: with a reference to 'Apol. 2. p. 98.'

Here the only difference consists in the additional words inclosed in a parenthesis in the middle of the passage; which signify, *residing in cities and countries;* and which show beyond controversy that "the people of a Bishop's diocese" are not intended, as Lord King supposes.[z]

It is to be noted that the words of the first quotation of this Section in the original, are all that Lord King has quoted in that place, page 17. In the second and third quotations (pages 19 and 42) there are other words following the word γίνεται. But it is evident from a dash between γίνεται and the following word in page 42, that there is an interval between them, and that they do not stand in immediate connexion. For the purpose of comparison, therefore, γίνεται is the proper word to close the quotation, and the more particularly as it is the word with which Lord King himself has closed the first quotation.

408. It is very obvious that these arguments founded on expressions of a general nature, when the subject agitated was not at all in view, are a poor reliance in opposition to the strong *facts* of the case, which no man can call in question. (See §195; 209, note; §242.)

409. Lord King proceeds thus,[a] "Ignatius writes, 'Where the Bishop is, there the people must be.' (*Epistle to the Smyrneans.*)" By turning to that Epistle in the Appendix, it will be found that Ignatius is, in Section 7, urging the Smyrneans to avoid those who would mislead them, and closes it with the words, "But flee all divisions, as the beginning of evils." "*See* (he continues in Section 8,) *that ye all follow your Bishop*, &c. *Wheresoever the Bishop shall appear, there let the people also be.* This is obviously a general charge to adhere to him, leaving all others. If it were to be taken literally, when Cyprian withdrew from Carthage, the people ought to have followed him, and it will not do to say, that he having withdrawn, they were released from obligation to him; for, he in his retirement governed them. (§191, 201, 202.)

410. Again he quotes from Ignatius, "It is unlawful to do any thing without him."[b] This passage in the original (as quoted by Lord King, same page,) is as follows: Οὐκ ἔξον ἐστὶν χωρὶς τοῦ ἐπισκόπου, οὔτε βαπτίζειν, οὔτε ἀγάπην ποιεῖν, that is, "*It is not lawful without the Bishop, neither to baptize, nor to celebrate the holy communion.*" The whole passage stands in the Appendix, in the 8th Section of the Epistle to the Smyrneans; and it will there be seen that, although *it was not lawful to do either with-*

---

z See §407, 2. a Page 17. b LORD KING, p. 17.

Digitized by Google

out the Bishop, it does not mean that he was to do every thing. For he says, "Let that Eucharist be looked upon as well established, which is either offered by the Bishop or *by him to whom the Bishop has given his consent*."

411. Moreover the utter impossibility of all meeting in one place, is shown by the fact that the villages about Alexandria, which whole region was in that *parish* or *diocese*, were attended to by Presbyters.[c]

412. Also by the fact, "that St. Austin's diocese of Hippo was above forty miles long: for he himself tells us, that Fessala, a place in his diocese,[d] was forty miles distant from Hippo. We also know that in Tripolis, one of the six provinces of the Roman Africa, there were but five Bishops."[e]

413. It is entirely unnecessary to say more to show the utter absurdity of the conclusion of Lord King, that 'the Bishop's Church was no bigger than our parishes.'[f]

414. He next attempts to show that "the Bishop had but one altar or communion table in his whole diocese, at which his whole flock received the sacrament from him."[g] In support of this he quotes these words, '*there is but one Altar as there is but one Bishop*.'[h] If the reader will turn to that Epistle, he will find in Sections 2, 3, and 4, (in the last of which occur the words quoted) that Ignatius is speaking of *divisions*, and warning them to avoid them and cleave to the Church; and is not alluding to *one particular* altar.[i]

415. He quotes likewise from Justin Martyr the following words: "The Bishop's whole diocese met together on Sunday, when the Bishop gave them the Eucharist; and if any were absent, he sent it to them by the Deacons."[k] This is a strange translation. I should make it thus: "On Sunday there is a meeting together of all; there is a distribution and a partaking by those administering the sacrament to each; and to those not present it is sent by the Deacons."[l] There is not a word like *Bishop* in the passage,

416. The next quotation is from Tertullian, as follows: "The Christians received the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper from the hands of the Bishop alone." This translation is also incorrect. It should run thus: "Neither do we take (the sacrament)

---

c ATHANASIUS' *second Apology*, quoted by BOWDEN, Vol. II. p. 188, [Vol. I. p. 276, 2d *ed.*] from BINGHAM, *Antiq.* Vol. I. p. 173, 8vo edit.

d [AUSTIN uses the very word *Parœcis* to signify the district under his care. Quoted by SLATER, *Original Draught*, p. 33.]

e BOWDEN, Vol. I. p. 84, [Vol. I. p. 42, 2d *ed.*] from MAURICE and BINGHAM, who quote the ancient *Notitia* of that Church, made about fifty years after the death of Austin.

f Page 18.

g *Ibid.* p. 18.

h *Epistle of* IGNATIUS *to the Philadelphians.*

i IGNATIUS has a number of passages of similar import. See Appendix.

k LORD KING, p. 19.

l "Τῇ τοῦ ἡλίου λεγομένῃ ἡμέρα πάντων ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συνέλευσις γίνεται, διάδοσις καὶ μετάληψις ἀπὸ τῶν ἐυχαριστηθέντων ἑκάστῳ γίνεται, καὶ τοῖς οὐ παροῦσι διὰ τῶν διακόνων πέμπεται. *Apolog.* 2, p. 98."

Digitized by Google

from the hand of any others than of those presiding."[m] It will be observed that the word *præsidentium*, 'those presiding,' is plural. But there is but *one Bishop* in a Church by Lord King's own showing.[n]

Lord King quotes this passage again, (page 111, Part 2) together with a quotation from Justin Martyr which shows very clearly that the Deacons also distributed the bread and wine; as well as with one from Cyprian, which shows the same thing: on which he makes this remark, "So that herein there was a diversity of customs." This however could not have been the case, particularly as Tertullian and Cyprian belonged to the same Church; the former in the end of the second century, the latter in the middle of the third. It is therefore evident that he has misapprehended the meaning of the word *præsidentium*, and that this term includes *all who preside over the people*, the Bishop, Presbyters, and Deacons; *all of whom* were *set over the people*, and from all of whom they received the sacrament of the Lord's Supper.[o]

417. Lord King next attempts to show, that "the other sacrament of Baptism was generally administered by the Bishops alone within their respective dioceses. So saith Tertullian, '*Before the Bishop we renounce the devil and the world.*'"[p]

418. This is a part of the same passage quoted last, (§416.) It is given in full in Section 180; and it is shown in §181, 182, 183, that the Presbyters and Deacons also baptized.[q] Lord King, it may be observed, translates both the singular and the plural word, both *antistes*,[r] and *præsidentium*, by the singular word *Bishop*; though he shows that there is but one Bishop in a Church, and therefore the plural word *præsidentium* cannot properly be thus translated.

419. Lord King also urges that the "Church's charity was deposited with the Bishop, who, as Justin Martyr reports, was the common curator and overseer of all the orphans, widows," &c.[s] True. But could he not employ agents? Did Cornelius look after every one of his fifteen hundred persons of this description? Eustatius and Aerius were schoolmates. When the former became Bishop, he made the latter a Presbyter, and set him over his hospital and place for entertaining the poor.[t]

420. "No offenders, he says, were restored again to the Church's peace, without the knowledge and consent of the whole diocese." In proof of this he quotes the 10th Epistle of Cyprian, in which it is said "they were to plead their cause before all the people."[u] This case however proves directly the reverse. The

---

m "Nec de aliorum manu quam præsidentium sumimus." *De Corona Militis*, cap. 3.

n See more on this point in Sections 181, 182.

o See Appendix, italic lines.

p LORD KING, p. 21.

q See likewise Sections 247 to 249, &c, and many of the passages in italics in the Appendix.

r See §177.

s LORD KING, p. 22.

t EPIPHAN. Κατὰ Αερίου.

u LORD KING, p. 23.

Digitized by Google

Church, in Cyprian's absence, had received some offenders without his approbation, and he thought, on too easy terms. He therefore turned them out again, to wait until he could give them a hearing, which he told them *they should have before all the people*, on his return, (see §201; 202.)

421. He endeavours to show that the diocese of Smyrna must have been very small. Granting it were so, it would amount to no more than what no one disputes, that some dioceses were small; but this does not affect the question. But what are the proofs even of this?

422. "Ignatius," he says, "advises Polycarp the Bishop of this Church, *To convene his diocese to choose a faithful honest man to send a messenger into Syria.*"[v] The word translated *diocese* in this quotation, is συμβούλιον, *council*. In the Appendix, Section 7 of the Epistle to Polycarp, it is translated *a select council*.

423. He proceeds, "So that the Bishop of this Church could know his whole flock personally by their names." For which he quotes, Εξ ονόματος πάντας ζήτει. Ζήτει does not signify *know*, but *inquire*; and there is no word for *personally* in the passage.[w]

424. Lord King goes on to mention other circumstances which he represents in a light altogether incredible. Thus, he says, speaking of Rome, "In this diocese there was but one Church or meeting place; for when Bishop Anterus died, all the brethren met together in the Church to choose a successor."[x] This was the year in which the Roman Emperor Gordianus entered upon his reign, *viz.* 239,[y] eleven years before Cornelius obtained the bishopric; who gave the account stated in §242, that there were in the Church of Rome fifteen hundred widows and afflicted persons; and forty-seven Presbyters and seven Deacons; besides a number of inferior officers for the service of the Church, among which are enumerated door-keepers, of whom there were no less than fifty-two. Observe the proportion of the number of door-keepers to that of those who officiated as ministers. One Bishop, forty-six Presbyters, seven Deacons; in all fifty-four; and fifty-two door-keepers. Could all these have been for one congregation?

425. Speaking of Alexandria, Lord King says, "that in the middle of the fourth century, they could all, or at least, most of them, meet together in one place."[z] Yet he admits that "in the third century they had divided themselves into several distinct and separate congregations, which were all subject to one Bishop:"[a] which admission destroys all he had been building up. For his argument is, that there being but one Bishop in a Church and nothing being lawful but what he did; there being

v Lord King, p. 27.
w See the *Epistle to Polycarp*, Section 4; and also pages 216, 217.
x Lord King, p. 32.
y Euseb. *Eccles. Hist.* Book VI. Chap. xxviii.
z Lord King, p. 38.
a *Ibid.* p. 38.

Digitized by Google

but one altar, and he alone administering the sacrament,[b] he alone baptizing,[c] there could be but one congregation in a Church: but here is evidence produced by himself, that there were several congregations under one Bishop, in the Church of Alexandria, even when all might, he says, have met in one house. How could he then doubt that the same branching out had taken place in Rome with a Church in which there were even fifteen hundred paupers? or in Jerusalem with its 'many times ten thousand' believers in the days of Paul? The truth is, however, that this Church of Alexandria had not so few members as Lord King represents. That Church was renowned for the number of its learned men from an early age, (See §332, 333, 336.) It supplied other Churches with Presbyters and with Bishops: their numbers and influence were so great that this Church ranked next to Rome, until Constantinople was built; an instance of which is seen in one of the decrees of the Council of Nice, which also shows the absurdity of the idea of the Bishop of Alexandria being the Pastor of a single congregation. The *ancient* custom was to be observed, that he should have charge of the Churches of Egypt, (§397.)

426. Let us now examine into the manner in which this author endeavours to establish what is laid down respecting the Presbyters in a former Section; (§378, 4) for the confirmation of which, these two things, he says, are to be proved:

1. That the Presbyters were the Bishop's curates and assistants, and so far inferior to them in the actual exercise of their ecclesiastical commission.

2. That yet, notwithstanding, they had the same inherent right with the Bishops, and so were not of a distinct specific order from them.

427. As to the first, Lord King succeeds very well in proving that Presbyters could do nothing but by authority received from the Bishop. The evidence abounds, and he produces a sufficiency.

428. With regard to the second; that the Presbyters, notwithstanding this palpable dependence, and incapacity to do a single thing without authority from the Bishop, "were of the very same specific order with him, having the same inherent right to perform those ecclesiastical offices which the Bishop did;" the evidence falls far short of proof.

429. To establish this he endeavours to show, "that by the Bishop's permission they discharged all those offices which a Bishop did." By the Bishop's permission they preached, they baptized, they administered the sacrament, they ruled in connexion with him, they restored returning penitents: all true, *by the permission of the Bishop*, as Lord King himself proves.

430. But as to *confirmation* and *ordination*, particularly the

b Lord King, p. 19. c *Ibid.* p. 21.

Digitized by Google

latter, what is the evidence that Presbyters were ever permitted to exercise *these* powers? As to their illegal acts, as in the cases before stated, (§360 to 364) they are out of the question. The instances were rare; the act was condemned at once; and no man, that we know of, undertook to contend for *the inherent right* until Aerius did, and he was pronounced a heretic.

431. With regard to the former power, Lord King says, "Presbyters confirmed, as we shall most evidently prove, when we come to treat of confirmation."[e] I cannot however find in that essay any thing upon the subject; but in the second part, afterwards published and bound together with the first, he attempts to fulfil his promise.

432. His first argument is, "that confirmation was an immediate consequent of Baptism;" and we may reasonably suppose that in a Church there were some fit to be baptized at least once a year; and sometimes it might happen that either the see was vacant, or the Bishop through persecution might be absent from his flock so long a time, as Cyprian was double the space; and if so, must no persons have been baptized within that time by reason of the Bishop's unavoidable absence? That seems a little hard, since, as was said before, they esteemed baptism and confirmation necessary to salvation, and to deprive those souls of salvation that died within that time, because they had not been confirmed by the Bishop, which was impossible, would be too severe and uncharitable."[f]

433. The reply to this argument is, 1. That confirmation did not always immediately follow baptism: 2. That confirmation was not deemed absolutely essential to salvation: 3. That whatever risk there was in delaying until a thing could be done properly, was incurred in this very absence of Cyprian, in a matter which, according to Lord King, was precisely the same, *viz.* in the case of those who after lapsing in time of persecution wished to be received again.

434. First, confirmation did not always follow baptism. It is remarkable that Lord King himself states a case which proves this, in another place.[g] "Cornelius objected against Novatian that he could scarcely acknowledge him a complete Christian, because being baptized in his bed, he had not received confirmation, or the additional rituals to baptism, *nor did he ever after receive them.*"

435. Secondly, confirmation was not deemed absolutely essential to salvation. The objection to Novatian, stated above, (§434) was made after he had contested Cornelius' election to the bishopric of the Church of Rome, and after Novatian's schism from that Church.[h] In the mean time, between this baptism and the contested election, he had been a Presbyter of

---

e LORD KING, p. 60. f *Ibid.* p. 91, 92. g *Ibid.* p. 88.
h EUSEB. *Eccles. Hist.* Book VI. Ch. xliii.

Digitized by Google

that Church and must have filled other inferior offices. Cornelius, even when writing a letter placing his bad conduct in a very strong light, only says, "he could *scarcely* acknowledge him to be a complete Christian;" (§434) and it is not to be believed that he could have exercised the office of Presbyter in the Church when deficient in a ceremony deemed essential to salvation.

436. Thirdly, As to the risk that might be incurred by waiting the Bishop's return, it was actually incurred during the very period to which Lord King refers, *viz.* Cyprian's two years absence from Carthage. It was during this time that he made the decision mentioned before; (§201) that those who had lapsed in time of persecution, should not be received until he should have it in his power to return and determine the matter. A delay of this kind occurred in Rome also after the death of Fabian. (See §241.) A similar risk was encountered by all who waited as usual until the regular time of baptism and confirmation, (§181) sometimes for almost a year.

437. The whole foundation of this argument, therefore, is unsound, and the conclusion falls.

438. The second argument of Lord King is: "That Presbyters did baptize, we have proved already; and since confirmation was done at the same time with baptism, *it is very reasonable to conclude*, that he that did the one, performed the other also."[i]

439. There is nothing in this argument to *convince* a man, when we remember that it was customary to baptize the new converts at a certain period, from Easter to the day of Pentecost, (§181;) and that on that solemn and great occasion the Bishop and Presbyters, as well as Deacons, were all present: that the convert confessed his sins under the hand of the Bishop in the Church and was then baptized, (§180.) See Section 247, &c.

440. The third and last argument is as follows: "That Presbyters did confirm, will appear most evidently from this very consideration, *viz.* That the imposition of hands on persons just after baptism, which we call confirmation, and the imposition of hands at the restitution of offenders, which we call absolution, was one and the self same thing."[k]

441. In support of this he quotes several passages, the purport of which is as follows: Cyprian says in his letters, that when a person from any heresy, desired to enter into the Church, he ought to be baptized, after which he should be confirmed; that is, hands should be laid on him that he may receive the HOLY SPIRIT;[l] but if he had been baptized in the Church and had left it, "on his return he is to be received by the imposition of hands alone, after penance, into the flock from whence he has strayed."[m]

---

i LORD KING, p. 92. 2d Part. k *Ibid.* p. 92, 2d Part.
l *Ibid.* p. 94; "manum imponere ad accipiendum SPIRITUM SANCTUM," §247, &c.
m *Ibid.* p. 99.

Digitized by Google

442. From these pasages he argues, that the ceremony of imposition of hands in these two cases was the same.[n] He then endeavours to show that Presbyters, sometimes with, and sometimes without the Bishop, imposed hands in the last case;[o] and concludes, "if Presbyters had power and authority to perform the latter, I see no reason why we should abridge them of the former."[p]

443. To which it is replied: First, that the conclusion that these two ceremonies, (the first of which Lord King calls confirmation, and properly, §247, &c. and the second absolution,) are the same, is not strictly correct. There was imposition of hands in both cases; but so was there in many other, as ordination; and therefore this did not constitute them the same. There was moreover this material difference. If the person had been baptized among heretics and had never been in the Church, he was, on being converted, baptized, and then hands were imposed on him that he might receive the HOLY GHOST, (§247, &c.) But if the heretic had been in the Church, had been baptized in it, had left it, and wished to return, he was not baptized; nor were hands imposed on him until *after penance*;[q] and this occupied from two to above ten years, according to circumstances, says Lord King;[r] and by the determination of the Council of Nice even those who renounced the faith to save their lives, were compelled to do penance "gerere pœnitentiam"—from three to thirteen years.[s]

444. Secondly, Lord King endeavours to shows that Presbyters, sometimes with the Bishop and sometimes without, imposed hands on those who had left the Church and returned.

445. To prove that Presbyters did sometimes, without the presence of the Bishop, by his permission, impose hands on the penitent, Lord King quotes three passages.

446. The first is the case of Serapion in Egypt, which he quotes from Eusebius; "Serapion being out of the Church's peace and approaching the hour of dissolution, sent for one of the Presbyters to absolve him, which the Presbyter did according to the order of the Bishop, who had before given his permission unto the Presbyters to absolve those who were in danger of death."[t] Here we are left to infer that the Presbyter imposed hands, which however was not done.

447. Eusebius states this matter thus; the account being given in a letter from Dionysius Bishop of Alexandria to Fabius Bishop of Antioch. Serapion was a harmless but weak old man, who in time of persecution had, to save his life, sacrificed. He had frequently intreated to be received again, but was not admitted. Being about to die, having revived after lying three

n LORD KING, p. 99. o *Ibid.* p. 99. p *Ibid.* p. 101.
q "Per manus impositionem solam recipi acta pœnitentia—penance being finished." CYPRIAN, p. 99.
r *Ibid.* p. 129, Part I. s RUFIN. *Eccles. Hist.* Book I. Ch. vi.
t *Ibid.* p. 100.

Digitized by Google

days speechless, he sent his little grandson to beg one of the Presbyters to visit him immediately. It was night and the Presbyter was sick. "But, says the Bishop, seeing that I had ordered that those about to die, if they asked it, and particularly if they had likewise formerly sought it with humility, ought to be received, that they might depart resting on a good hope, he gave the boy a little of the Eucharist, and commanded that he should pour it into the mouth of the old man drop by drop." This was done, and Serapion died in peace.[u] In this case the Presbyter did not even see the person, and therefore did not impose his hands on him: nor is there a word said in the whole chapter about imposition of hands.

448. The other two passages are from Cyprian, "who, when he was in exile, ordered his clergy to confess and absolve by imposition of hands, those who were in danger of death."[v] In the other quotation Cyprian directs if any were in danger, that they should not wait for him, "but that they might make confession of their sin to any Presbyter near them; that his hand being laid on them in penitence, they might go to God in peace."[w]

449. Presbyters were, however, permitted by Cyprian to do this only in this single case of the last extremity. For, during Cyprian's exile, when the Presbyters undertook to receive a number of lapsed persons who wished to return to the Church, he blamed them very much, and annulled the act, directing them to wait until he could return and determine the matter. (§201, 202; see also 241.)

450. These cases, therefore, prove indeed that Cyprian permitted Presbyters to impose hands *in one* specified extreme case. But, first, the restriction to these cases proves the *restriction from* all others: and, secondly, they were not cases of confirmation.

451. First, The restriction of the Presbyters, by Cyprian, to the single specified case of immediately approaching death, because the Bishop could not be had in time, proves beyond doubt that they were *restricted from* the performance of this ceremony in every case in which the person could safely wait the usual time.

452. Secondly, These were not cases of confirmation. By confirmation the person confirmed was made a member of the Church; and his influence, good or bad, affected the Church as long as he lived. By imposition of hands upon a dying penitent, the object was not to receive him into the Church, but merely to enable one who had been in the Church, (and therefore had been confirmed,) and had left it through fear of torment or death, "*to die in peace*." (§448.) The cases stated and those referred to during Cyprian's exile were all of this kind, (§447, 448.) And in conformity with this representation, if the sick man recovered, he was not allowed the privileges of a member

u Euseb. *Eccles. Hist.* Book VI. Ch. xliv.
v Lord King, p. 100.
w *Ibid.* p. 101, the Latin.

Digitized by Google

of the Church, but continued in the same state in which he was before the ceremony performed when he was believed to be at the point of death. Thus, the fourteenth regulation of the Council of Nice ran thus: "But of those penitents who depart this life, they decree, that no one ought to be dismissed without the communion. If any one, indeed, having received the communion should survive, that he ought to fulfil the stated time (of penitence,) (§443) or at least according as the Bishop might wish to moderate it."[x]

Add to this, that there is no evidence produced that imposition of hands was practised in these cases of extremity, except what is quoted above from Cyprian. It was not practised in the case in Alexandria, (§447.) It is not mentioned in the decree of the Council of Nice; but it is barely said that the penitent, who had been denied the privilege of the communion during his state of penitence, (447) should not be dismissed without the benefit of it. Cyprian, therefore, is the only one, as far as we know, who directed this; and "Cyprian, says Bishop Taylor,[y] was a man so complying with the subjects of his diocese, that, if any man, he was like to furnish us with an antinomy."

453. To prove that Presbyters imposed hands together with the Bishop in the reception of offenders, Lord King quotes two passages from Cyprian. "Offenders, saith he, receive the light (right) of communion by the imposition of the hands of the Bishop and of his clergy."[z] This translation does not appear to me to be correct. It should, I think, stand thus: "They receive the right of communion by the imposition of the hand of the Bishop and clergyman."[a] In this passage, which is a literal translation of the Latin quotation of Lord King in the same page, the word *hand* is singular; whereas if he had in view a number of persons present and officiating, he would have used the plural. Moreover, Cyprian does not use the word *clerus* for Presbyter in any of the passages quoted from him; but the word *Presbyterum*. It is also to be considered that this is not a case of confirmation, as has been fully proved: and when speaking of confirmation he evidently excludes Presbyters. He says, "Which is done likewise now among us, that they who are baptized in the Church, be offered to the Bishops, and by *our* prayer and imposition of (our) hand receive the HOLY SPIRIT, and be consummated with the LORD'S seal."[b] (§247, &c.) Again,

---

x "De his vero qui vita excedunt pœnitentibus, decernunt, vacuum nullum debere dimitti. Si quis sane accepta communione, supervixerit, debere eum tempora statuta complere, vel certe prout moderari Episcopus voluerit. RUFIN. *Eccles. Hist.* Lib. I. cap. vi.

y *Works*, Vol. VII. p. 137.

z *Ibid.* p. 100.

a "Per impositionem *manus* Episcopi et Cleri jus communicationis accipiunt. *Ep.* x. §2. p. 30." [See note to Section 553.]

b "Quod nunc quoque apud nos geritur, ut qui in Ecclesia baptizantur, præpositis Ecclesiæ offerantur; et per nostram orationem ac manus impositionem SPIRITUM SANCTUM consequantur, et signaculo Dominico consummentur. *Epist.* 73. §8. p. 220." LORD KING'S *Enquiry*, &c. 2nd Part, p. 89.

Digitized by Google

if Presbyters joined in the imposition of hands in ordinary cases, even of receiving offenders, where was the need of a special permission in extreme cases? (§448) and why an exclusion in those which were not? (§449.)

454. It is therefore evident; 1) That Presbyters were not permitted to lay on hands except in cases of the last extremity: 2) That this liberty was allowed by Cyprian only, as far as we can judge from the evidence; and he was in the habit of allowing unusual latitude to his Presbyters, (§452) and felt the consequences very apt to follow laxity of rule, and complained heavily of their conduct: (§153, 201, 202:) 3) That not one of the cases produced is a case of *confirmation;* either actually, or by Lord King's construction. Not actually; because no one was a case of a heretic coming into the Church, in whose case the imposition of hands would have been Confirmation. Nor by Lord King's construction; because no one was a case of a heretic who had been in the Church and wished to return to it; in which case the imposition of hands was called, according to Lord King, *absolution*, and which he argues is the same as Confirmation; but which is not, (§452.) Every case cited is a case of a simple offender who had not departed from the Church; but had lost his standing through weakness of resolution in time of persecution, who had begged to be readmitted, and was in the preparatory state of *penitence;* and when dying was allowed the privilege of *communion*, without even the imposition of hands, except when permitted or directed by Cyprian, in order that he might depart in peace; and not, that he might thereby be received into the Church, (§452.)

455. Lastly; Lord King says, "If Presbyters had power and authority to perform the latter, I see no reason why we should abridge them of the former." (§440.) This is not the kind of proof Lord King promised, (§431.) It is of very little importance for us to say *we cannot see why* a thing was done in one case and not in another. If the imposition of hands in the case stated by Lord King were the same, as he supposes, with confirmation, why could he not produce something to show imposition of hands by Presbyters in cases decidedly of the latter? That he could not do so, is because they *are* different cases, and Presbyters did not impose hands in Confirmation.

456. Lord King next proceeds to the subject of *ordination*, in his attempt to show "that Presbyters, by the Bishop's permission, discharged all those offices that a Bishop did."[c] "As for ordination, he says, I find but little said of this in antiquity; yet as little as there is, there are clearer proofs of the Presbyters ordaining, than there are of their administering the Lord's Supper."[d]

457. After this round assertion he produces but one passage in support of it besides that of Timothy; and that one not correctly represented, as will be shown; whereas, there is an abundance

c LORD KING, p. 58, Pt. I. d *Ibid.* p. 61, Pt. I.

Digitized by Google

of evidence that Presbyters administered the sacrament. Without searching for any other evidence than has been incidentally mentioned in these pages, the reader is referred to the following Sections: §181, 182, 183 compared; 201, 235, 416, note to 419, 447.[e]

458. The single quotation Lord King produces in support of the opinion that Presbyters ordained, is as follows: "All power and grace, saith Firmilian, is constituted in the Church, where Seniors preside, who have the power of baptizing, confirming, and ordaining."[f] The words translated here *Seniors*, are *majores natu;* which signify *old men*,[g] and are not the technical term for *Elders*. Lord King, aware that this argument wants support, seeks it by quoting a passage from Tertullian, which he says has been considered as a parallel passage. The passage runs thus: "Probati seniores præsident." "Now, says Lord King, by these *approved Elders*, *Bishops* and *Presbyters* must necessarily be understood; *because Tertullian speaks here of the discipline exerted in one particular Church or parish*, in which there was but one Bishop; and if he only had presided, then there could not have been Elders in the plural number; but there being many Elders, to make out the number we must add Presbyters to the Bishop, who also presided with him, as we shall more fully show in another place." (p. 61.)

459. This argument rests upon the assertion that Tertullian in the above quotation, '*Probati præsident seniores*' was speaking of the discipline exerted in one particular Church. That this was not the fact, it needs only to read the passage, at once to perceive. It occurs in Tertullian's *Apology against the Nations*. He had, in the preceding chapters, been engaged in refuting the charges commonly brought against the Christians by the heathen nations, and in retorting upon them, with a great deal of force, by quoting the known instances of depraved conduct in their most celebrated philosophers. The chapter in which the passage in question occurs, commences thus:

"I will now give an account of the affairs of the Christian sect, (or *company*—'*factionis Christianæ*') that I who have refuted the evil, may point out the good things. We are a body (or one body) respecting the knowledge of religion, the unity of discipline, and the covenant of hope. We come together, &c. We pray, &c. We are collected, &c. Truly we feed our faith with holy words, we elevate our hope, &c." These are the commencing words of the different sentences which precede the quotation in question. Then follow the words of the quotation: "Certain approved old men preside," &c. "*Præsident probati quique seniores*," &c.[h] It appears to me that no man can hesitate to say that this language is used of the whole body. The

e See also Section 2 of IGNATIUS' *Epistle to the Trallians*, and Section 8 of that *to the Smyrneans*.

f *Ibid.* p. 61.

g See *natu* in AINSWORTH'S *Dictionary*, quarto.

h TERTULL. *Apol.* Cap. xxxix.

Digitized by Google

first words in which he expresses his intention, as well as the first words he uses in attempting to accomplish his purpose, point it out. 'I will give an account of the Christian sect,' &c.—'We are a body,' &c. The argument, therefore, resting on this construction falls to the ground.

460. The word *preside* is general, and may be spoken of Bishops alone, or Bishops and Presbyters, according to circumstances. In this case, Tertullian was speaking of the Church Universal, and, therefore, he might use the term in speaking of the Bishops alone, who more especially presided; and by those whom he was addressing, they were so particularly looked upon as the presiding persons, that they were always first and chiefly aimed at in persecutions, of which abundant evidence could easily be produced. An instance may be seen in Section 198; Cyprian the Bishop was compelled to fly, but the Presbyters could remain safely when a persecution was but threatened. This word *preside* not only *may*, but *must* mean Bishops in this passage, if it be a parallel passage with that from Firmilian: for, it is certain from his own declaration that the latter was speaking of Bishops.

It is remarkable that in another place, where Tertullian was certainly speaking of the ceremonies as practised in an individual Church, and unquestionably included the Presbyters in the term *presiding persons*, Lord King translates the word '*præsidentium*' by the word Bishop.[i]

461. But why seek an explanation of the meaning of a passage from comparing it with language that others have used, when the writer explains his own meaning in the very epistle from which it is taken. Firmilian in this same epistle uses these words: "How is this, that when we see Paul baptized his disciples again after John's baptism, we should make any doubt of baptizing them who return from heresy to the Church, after that unlawful and profane baptism of theirs, unless Paul was less than *these Bishops of whom we are speaking now*, that these indeed might have the HOLY GHOST by imposition of hands alone, but Paul was insufficient for it."[k] See another passage equally decisive from the same Epistle in Section 206.

462. Firmilian was arguing the question, which at that time was much agitated, whether those who came to the Church from the heretics ought to be baptized before they were confirmed. He agreed with Cyprian, to whom this Epistle was addressed, that they ought to be baptized. He argues in the passage quoted by Lord King that "All power and grace is settled in the Church, *where* the *majores natu* preside, who possess the power of baptizing, of imposing hands, (confirming; §247, &c.) and of ordaining."

463. Firmilian being a Bishop, intimate with Cyprian, agree-

i See §416, in connexion with §179 to 183.
k BOWDEN's *Letters*, Vol. I. p. 138. [Vol. I. p. 67, 2d *ed.*]

Digitized by Google

ing with him in doctrine, it would not be reasonable to conclude from this passage alone, that '*majores natu*' signify Presbyters; because it is declared *in it*, that these '*majores natu*' possess the *power* of baptizing, confirming, and ordaining: a doctrine totally opposed to every thing on record if spoken of Presbyters, (see §153, 191, 201, 202,) and *unsupported by a single fact:* Lord King not having been able to bring forward *one;* but resting the whole argument for Presbyters' ordaining on this single quotation from Firmilian.

464. If in this single passage, the word instead of being '*majores natu*,' literally *old men*, had even been *Presbyteri*, there would be good reason to believe it interpolated; because it would be so totally opposed to all the ancient writings of the Church, that there cannot be produced *one quotation* in which these powers are attributed to the Presbyters; but, on the contrary, whenever the question arises, by the forwardness of some of that order, it is instantly decided that they have no such right.

465. But when, in addition to these considerations, we have Firmilian's own declaration, that in this Epistle he is speaking of Bishops, (§461) contest is at an end.

466. It is furthermore to be observed, that all Lord King urges on this passage is, that '*majores natu*' included both the Bishop and his Presbyters, and that "*both they and the Bishop* ordained together, both laying on their hands in ordination, as Timothy was ordained by the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery; that is, by the hands of the Bishop and Presbyters of that parish where he was ordained, as is the constant signification of the word *Presbytery*, in all the writings of the ancients."[l]

467. By his own account therefore, a Bishop was present at the ordination of Timothy spoken of in Paul's first Epistle to him, and Paul must have been that Bishop, (see pp. 209, 210.) It has already been shown that this ordination was to the office of Presbyter, (§93.) There is therefore nothing in this case but what is at this day practised in the Episcopal Church in the ordination of Presbyters. The imposition of their hands is however unnecessary. Without it the ordination is valid;[m] while the imposition of their hands without that of a Bishop, has, in all ages, been declared invalid, (§359 to 366.) Indeed this practice of the Presbyters laying on of hands in the ordination of even a Presbyter, is an innovation upon the most ancient practice. There cannot, I think, be produced a solitary case in which Presbyters imposed hands with a Bishop, in the ordination of a Presbyter, from any of the fathers of the first four centuries; for, although I have not read them thoroughly, or all of them, yet if such a case exist, it would have been produced. As to the Scriptures, in not one case of ordination mentioned in the New Testament is there a word said about Presbyters or Elders imposing hands, unless it be in the case of Timothy's ordination to

l Lord King, p. 62, Part I.

m Acts xiv. 23; Sections 191, 232.

Digitized by Google

the office of Presbyter. The ordination of the seven Deacons was by the Apostles.[n] The Apostles Barnabas and Paul ordained Elders in all the Churches of Asia which they planted in their tour together.[o] In Paul's directions to Timothy and Titus not a word is said about the aid of Elders in the ordinations they were directed to perform. Nothing like the aid of a Presbyter occurs in a single passage on the subject, except it be intended in the solitary passage respecting Timothy's ordination to the office of Presbyter. The translation, in the passage relating to this ordination, of the word πρεσβυτεριον by the words *the office of Presbyter*, instead of *the Presbytery*, is not therefore so absurd as Dr. Miller represents it. The passage so translated runs thus—*Neglect not the gift of the office of Presbyter, which is in thee with the laying on of hands.* This translation requires not the change of a single word, or even letter. The word πρεσβυτεριον is used by Eusebius in many instances for the office of *Presbyter*.[p] This reading corresponds with Paul's declaration, that it was by the imposition of his hands that Timothy received the gift;[q] as also with all the other cases in the New Testament in which the Apostles alone laid on hands or ordained. In all the cases of ordination, viz. in the passages, Acts vi. 6; xiv. 23; 1 Tim. iv. 14; 2 Tim. i. 6; the words used in the original signify *the laying on of hands.* This reading corresponds also with Paul's directions to Timothy with regard to ordaining Presbyters and Deacons, in which there is no mention of any Presbyter to assist him: neither is there in the directions to Titus. It corresponds with the practice of the Church for centuries after the days of the Apostles, there being no mention, as far as I have been able to discover, of any imposition of hands by Presbyters in the ordination of Presbyters in any of the writers examined, and not a case produced by any advocate of that doctrine. "Presbyters, in the primitive Church, did never join with Bishops in collating holy orders of Presbyter and Deacon, till the fourth council of Carthage; much less do it alone, rightly, and with effect."[r] This was in the year 657.[s] [See note [k] to §517.]

468. The word Πρεσβυτέριον, moreover, was understood to signify the office by the Latin fathers; while the Greek fathers consider it as signifying a collective body; not, however, of Presby-

n Acts vi. 6.

o Acts xiv. 23.

p The following expressions from Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History, are specimens of this—χείρας εἰς πρεσβυτέριον αὐτῷ τεθείκασι. (Lib. VI. c. viii.)—"They had ordained him to *the office of Presbyter.*" Πρεσβυτεριον cannot here signify any thing else. So, "Πρεσβυτερίου χειροθεσίαν ἐν Καισαρείᾳ πρὸς τῶν τῇδε ἐπισκόπων ἀναλαμβάνει." (Lib. VI. c. xxiii.) "He received the grade of *the office of Presbyter* in Cæsarea from the Bishops of that place." This might properly enough be translated *the grade* of Presbyter; but though meaning the same thing here, it is not a literal translation; and it would not answer to translate πρεσβυτεριον by the word *Presbyter* in the first example given. These passages both relate to Origen. (See § 333.) Another instance: Ἡ τετάρτη ἀυτοῦ τῶν περὶ βαπτίσματος ἐπιστολῶν, πρὸς τὸν κατὰ Ῥώμην ἐγράφη Διονύσιον, τότε μεν πρεσβείου ἠξιωμένον, &c. (Lib. VII. c. vii.) the translation of which is given in the first lines of Section 334.

q 2 Tim. i. 6.

r TAYLOR'S *Works*, Vol. VII. p. 139.

s *Ibid.* 137.

Digitized by Google

ters, but of Bishops.[t] With the Latin fathers agreed Erasmus, one of the most learned men in the sixteenth century,[u] and Calvin. The latter uses the following language: "But Paul speaks of himself as having laid hands upon Timothy, without any mention of many others having united with him, *I put thee in remembrance, that thou stir up the gift of* God *which is in thee, by the putting on of my hands.* His expression in the other Epistle, *of the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery*, I apprehend not to signify a company of Elders, but to denote the ordination itself; as if he had said, Take care that the grace which thou receivedst by the laying on of hands, when I ordained thee a Presbyter, be not in vain."[v]

469. Dr. Miller represents this opinion of Calvin as the result of an immature judgment. "But Calvin," he says in his *Letters*, p. 58, "soon afterwards, when he came to write his *Commentary*, and when his judgment was more mature, gave a very different opinion."

470. The facts are these. Calvin was born in 1509. The dedication of his work to the King of France is dated 1536. He was, therefore, twenty-seven years of age when he wrote the work. It passed through many editions in his life time, "and every time was further improved and enlarged by him, till in the year 1559, twenty-three years after the first impression, he put the finishing hand to his work, and published it in Latin and French, with his last corrections and additions."[w] He died in 1564. This finishing hand was, therefore, put to the work five years before he died, and when he did not expect to live one.[x] The work after this last revision passed through five or six editions,[y] and the passage above quoted still stands in the place above referred to.

471. After his poor array of testimony to support the claims of Presbyters, Lord King proceeds thus: "Though as to every particular act of the Bishop's office, it could not be proved particularly that a Presbyter did discharge them; yet it would be sufficient, if we could prove that in the general a Presbyter could and did perform them all." He then quotes the following from Cyprian in exile to his Presbyters, as evidence that they could do so: "He exhorts and begs them to discharge their own and his office too, that so nothing might be wanting either to discipline or diligence."[z] Cyprian's words are, "Do both your *part* there and mine, that nothing may be wanting either to *discipline or diligence*."[a] That Cyprian did not intend they should

t "Ου περι Πρεσβυτερων φησιν ενταυθα , αλλα περι Επισκοπων." St. Chrysostom.—"He speaks not of Presbyters here, but of Bishops. So Theophylact, as Theodoret; and Œcumenius." Taylor's *Works*, Vol. VII. p. 119.

u Taylor's *Works*, Vol. VII. p. 119.

v See Calvin's *Institutes*, Book IV. ch. iii. § xvi.

w *Translator's Preface*, p. ix.

x *Author's Preface*, p. 2.

y *Translator's Preface*, p. ix.

z *Primitive Church*, p. 62.

a "Fungamini illic et vestris partibus ac meis, ut nihil vel ad disciplinam, vel ad diligentiam desit." *Enquiry*, p. 62.

Note: In some of the references to King's Enquiry, the *Part* has not been men-

Digitized by Google

execute every part of *his office* cannot be doubted, from several passages already quoted, which the reader is requested to turn to.[b] Lord King quotes another passage from Cyprian of similar import, which has been already stated and answered.[c]

472. He quotes, lastly, a passage from a letter from the Presbyters of Rome, "written on the same occasion," (by which I understand the exile or death of their Bishop,) in which they say, "And since it is incumbent upon us, who are as it were Bishops, *to keep the flock* in the room of the pastor," &c. This is very far short of performing all the offices of a Bishop. That the Roman Presbyters had no idea that they could do so is evident from their letter already quoted. (See §241.)

473. Lord King has entirely passed over the objection to his doctrine arising out of the ordination of Bishops. Ordination to an office conveys the idea of introduction into one which the person did not hold. If Presbyter and Bishop were the same office, grade, or order, Why were Presbyters ordained when they were appointed to a bishopric? What was the second ordination for? (See §263.)

He allows that "the more Bishops there were present at an instalment, the more did its validity and unexceptionableness appear. Whence Cyprian argues the undeniable legality of Cornelius's promotion to the see of Rome because he had *sixteen Bishops* present at his ordination."[d] Cornelius himself, however, stated that there were in Rome forty-six Presbyters, (§242.) If the Presbyters were of the same order, and had an inherent right to ordain, why was not the boast made that there were sixty-two present?

474. Truly it must be admitted that Lord King has produced a small amount of testimony to support the claim he is advocating. Not a single case quoted of Presbyters' confirming; but in place thereof, a laboured attempt to prove that the absolution of a penitent offender, re-admitted *to the communion*, is the same as confirmation; in order that the laying on of hands directed by Cyprian in the former case, and certainly not always practised, if ever necessary, (§447) may be represented as a case of confirmation: which, connected with the fact that a case of the latter is not produced, is equivalent to an acknowledgement that it cannot be done. Not a solitary case quoted to prove Presbyters ordained; but instead thereof, a solitary quotation, which says nothing in favour of the doctrine of itself; but must be bolstered up with another, the bearing of which is manifestly misapprehended and misrepresented, and consequently affords it no assistance; while the main proposition is itself shown, by the very letter in which it occurs, to relate, not to Presbyters, as Lord King represents, but to Bishops, (§461.)

---

tioned. But where it is not mentioned, the reader will find the passage quoted, at the marked place, in one or other of the two Parts.

b See Sections 191, 201. c See §196 to 200. d Page 50.

Digitized by Google

475. Let the reader now pause for a moment, and consider on the one hand, the small amount of testimony offered by this writer, and the emptiness, the perfect weakness of that which is offered; as well as the entire absence of facts to show the exercise by Presbyters of the powers of confirming and ordaining; together with the learning and abilities of Lord King, which are a pledge that all was done that could be, for the cause: and on the other, the abounding facts, the express declarations, to show that these offices were performed by Bishops from the commencement. Let him consider what an infinite variety of expressions, directly on the subject, and incidentally mentioning things relating to it, or alluding to it, have been quoted in these pages; and not one inconsistent with the Episcopal doctrine—not one countenancing the Presbyterian. Let him reflect for a moment upon the exalted character of Ignatius, testified by the expressions of high approbation of Polycarp, and the great desire of the Churches of Asia to have his last Epistles; upon his long services, his great devotion to the cause, his willing martyrdom, his triumphant death; upon the clearness with which he in very many instances speaks of the three orders of ministers in the Church, the superiority of the Bishops, and the subordination of the Presbyters; upon the total absence of any doubtful expression respecting this point; upon the certainty that Ignatius died but a few years after John; and therefore that his episcopate was during the life time of that Apostle, and doubt if he can that the order of the Church was episcopal during the days of the Apostles.

476. Before bringing this Essay to a close it is proposed to notice briefly some minor objections, cavils, &c. which have been made against the doctrines herein advocated.

477. It has been alleged that many Episcopalians, during the progress of the Reformation and since, have admitted the validity of the ministry of the Reformed Churches which have not episcopal ordination.

478. To this it is replied that this is, at most, but the opinion of these Episcopalians, formed upon various considerations; in some, from affectionate regard for individual Reformers of the Churches not episcopal; in others, perhaps in all of the early English Reformers, from fear of the consequences of breaking with those Churches, &c. But our judgment is not to be made up from what they thought. Dr. Miller protests against the introduction of the opinions of even the early fathers, the devoted martyrs. How much less ought we to be influenced by that of these men, who were operated upon by the most powerful motives, such as are eminently calculated to disturb the judgment!

479. Some of those who, in the progress of the Reformation and since, were in the English Church, were not Episcopalians in principle, but were secretly plotting to subvert the order of the Church; of which there is ample evidence in Fuller's *History*. Even some Bishops were suspected of being opposed to

Digitized by Google

it, after their return from the continent where they were driven by the accession of Mary to the crown of England.

480. All were more or less influenced by the fear of breaking with the continental Reformers, whose friendship they deemed essential to their safety. The contest between the Protestant and Catholic parties was excessively violent. Many persons were burnt in England, many in Spain. In France 30,000 were murdered on St. Bartholomew's day. Political motives were connected with these excesses. The great men of different countries headed the parties, and used their efforts for their own advancement. Elizabeth of England, in the commencement of her reign, was so cautious that for many weeks the mass was celebrated in her own chapel with great pomp. She was jealous of the claim of the catholic queen, Mary of Scotland, to the dominion of the whole island; and Don John of Austria had formed the scheme of marrying Mary, and laying claim to the crown of England. He was then Governor of Holland under Philip II. King of Spain, the husband of the late queen Mary, Elizabeth's sister. Elizabeth was aware of these schemes, and of the enmity of the Popish Princes towards her. Common enemies made her and the Hollanders friends from interest. They being hard pressed, offered her the sovereignty of the country, which she wisely refused; but nevertheless aided them with money and afterwards with troops. These political as well as, what may have been miscalled, religious considerations, led to the equipment of the Spanish Armada for the invasion of England. It was long in agitation; vessels were collecting in the ports of the continent to transport troops; the most formidable fleet that had ever put to sea, was long in preparation; all England was in a similar state of alarm to that we have witnessed when she was threatened in like manner, of late years, by Napoleon; but much greater, because of the greater violence and ferocity of the former age, the English being threatened with fire and faggot, torture and chains. The friendship of the continental Reformers was so necessary that Elizabeth had refused to take some measures, proposed by her council, which were calculated to inflame a difference between the Pope and the Spanish King, through fear of exciting suspicions as to her motives in the breasts of the Protestant Princes of Europe. Add to this that the leaders of the Reformation were men of first rate talents and learning; that their influence in political affairs was great; that their abilities were in constant exercise against the Popish claims: so that in every point of view it was of the utmost importance to secure their good will. Moreover, when, upon Mary's accession to the crown of England, the English Reformers fled to the continent, they were received with the utmost cordiality, and treated with the greatest friendship and hospitality, as long as they were under the necessity of continuing in exile. The powerful influence of Calvin led some to adopt his theological opinions entirely, while others were more or less influenced: of which, as well as

Digitized by Google

other things here stated, there is abundant evidence in Fuller; who gives an account of the differences which thus grew up among the English exiles in Frankfort, Zurich, and Geneva.

481. Fear of deadly enemies, partiality to friends, and gratitude for essential services, agreement in almost all other essential points, and community of danger, led to an union against the common enemy, and to a willingness, on the part of the Episcopalians, to hear every thing that could be said in favour of the church government of the calvinistic Churches, and to believe that their ministry was valid.

482. Most of these Episcopal writers founded their opinions on the community of name of Presbyter and Bishop in the New Testament, and on the declaration of Jerome that at first the Church was governed by a common council of Presbyters, but afterwards by a Bishop set over them. This they took for granted was by the successors of the Apostles; and therefore was not absolutely binding on us, inasmuch as whatever the Apostles left as the order of the Church, is valid. They did not however advert to the fact that Jerome has given no evidence of this; that, even admitting it were true, he himself says it was done in consequence of the divisions at Corinth, in the time of the Apostles, and consequently was done by them; and that he even expressly states that the Apostles appointed Timothy, Titus, James, and Mark, Bishops. On this subject the reader is referred to the following Sections: 218 to 232, 243, 244, 250, 380 and note.

483. Some of them rest their opinion on the statement that in Alexandria Presbyters ordained the Bishops until the time of Dionysius and Heraclas. Archbishop Usher is said to have stated this to Charles I. on the Isle of Wight. There is however, no author produced in support of this. Jerome is said to have stated it; but he did not. And if he had, as he wrote above an hundred years after Dionysius was ordained, his assertion could be no *testimony*, because it did not come within his own knowledge; and he cannot and does not quote any body who did know. It is sufficient however that he did not say it. Archbishop Usher's opinion or concession therefore stands on ground that will not support it. On this subject see Sections 255 to 263.

484. When Bishops were to be ordained for the Church of Scotland in 1610, Archbishop Bancroft ordained three, who on their return to that country ordained others. "As they had been Presbyters before this time," says Dr. Miller, "Archbishop Bancroft proceeded to their consecration as Bishops, without requiring them to be previously re-ordained as Priests, expressly delivering it as his opinion, that their former Presbyterian ordination was valid."[e]—It would indeed be very remarkable if this concession was made by Archbishop Bancroft, whom Dr. Miller in that

[e] *Letters*, p. 229. [p. 146, 2d *ed.*]

Digitized by Google

very page represents as the first man in England who preached "the divine right of episcopacy." Dr. Bowden speaking of this transaction, says "He (the Archbishop) said that there was no necessity for the Scotch Bishops passing through the intermediate orders of Deacon and Priest; '*for that the episcopal character might be fully conveyed at a single consecration*;'[f] and for this he cited two precedents in the ancient Church. The examples were Ambrose, Bishop of Milan, and Nectarius, Bishop of Constantinople."[g]

485. Stillingfleet's concessions also are often quoted, without the least notice or intimation of the fact, that he in the most public manner, afterwards, not only in sermons delivered on the most public occasions, but in a printed work, retracted that opinion and wrote against it. To his *argument* we have nothing now to say.—Whatever he did or could bring forward has been done by others, and for an answer the reader is referred to the preceding pages. All we have to do with here is the *opinion* he gave in favour of the validity of presbyterian ordination; and to that we oppose his better judgment at a more advanced age, after long and deep examination of the subject. He published his first work at *twenty-four* years of age; his last at *forty-five*. In the last, addressing those whom he had thereby offended, he says, "Will you not allow one single person who happened to write about these matters when he was very young, in twenty years time of the most busy and thoughtful part of his life, to see reason to alter his judgment?" In the same he says, "The case of Timothy is an uncontrollable instance of diocesan episcopacy." In a sermon he says, "I cannot find any argument of force in the New Testament to prove that ever the Christian Churches were under the sole government of Presbyters." Again, "This succession was not in mere presidency of order; but the Bishops succeeded the Apostles in the government over those Churches." Furthermore, "There is as great reason to believe the apostolical succession to be of divine institution, as the canon of Scripture, or the observation of the LORD's day."[h]

486. This last sentence is particularly striking, and unquestionably true. There was a great number of writers in the very first century. The Churches had many Epistles and Gospels in their possession. It became a question, after some years, what were and what were not, the writings of the Apostles. Eusebius tells us that certain Epistles and Gospels were universally received All the Churches had them, they being handed down to them from the Apostles. Others were not; and were excluded, (§323.) This decision we confide in. We receive the New Testament from the fathers and have no better testimony, and

f COLLIER's *Eccles. Hist.* Vol. II. p. 702.
g BOWDEN's *Letters*, Vol. II. p. 62. [Vol. I. p. 215, 2d *ed.*]
h *Ibid*, Vol. II. p. 115. [Vol. I. p. 241, 2d *ed.*]

Digitized by Google

want no better, than their declaration, which they maintained unto death and sealed with their blood, that it was written by the Apostles. With their testimony on this subject, we have their equally positive declaration that the Apostles who wrote this book, appointed the Bishops their successors to govern the Church. (See §125, 130, 185, 194, 206, 243, 257, 282, 326, 380 note, 381.)

487. The same kind of evidence is relied on upon every point of Christian doctrine; Baptism, (§106, 107, 231,) the LORD'S Supper, and even the divinity of the Saviour. On the last subject it is well known what plausible arguments are built by Infidels upon the doubtful phrases of Scripture, and upon the occasional alterations they take the liberty of making with texts that cannot otherwise be perverted. When this fundamental doctrine was attacked in ancient days, what was the mode of repelling the assault? The language is; "For all our ancestors (predecessors, *majores*,) say that the Apostles themselves likewise believed and taught what they themselves now say."[i]

488. The very same evidence precisely have we for the episcopal order of the Church. *The fathers say that the Apostles appointed the Bishops their successors in the government of the Church in their place.* (See §130, 185, 194, 206, 243, 326, 380 note, 381.)

489. To revert for a moment to Stillingfleet's opinion, Dr. Miller objects warmly to the plea of immaturity of judgment, although he was but *twenty-four* years of age when the work was published; although the subject was very important and extensive; and although he put in the plea himself after deep and attentive consideration for above twenty years additional: while he puts in the same plea for Calvin at the age of twenty-seven, about the meaning of a single word, although this author, after repeated revisions and corrections of the work for twenty-three years more, allowed that signification to stand as quoted.[k]

490. What moreover does such concession amount to? The very raising the question, with the concession and the pleading of the concession, presupposes a doubt arising out of the innovation upon the established order of the Church; and the parties concerned in the innovation needlessly risk the consequences of separation and schism, upon a point at best questionable, and satisfy themselves with the opinion of some of those who continue steadfast, who, variously influenced, have been led to suppose them excusable.

491. Some argue that the success which has attended the ministry of the Churches not episcopal shows that the blessing of GOD is with them, and therefore that he approves of what they have done.

---

i EUSEB. *Eccles. Hist.* Book V. Chap. xxviii.

k See §468 to 470.

Digitized by Google

492. This is a popular argument and a most singular one. It represents the Divine Being as having established a Church, and, when some fifteen hundred years afterwards a party has broken through the established order and devised a plan of their own, as pardoning the irregularity because it turned out well. It would indeed be very strange if the truths of the Gospel should lose their effect when declared by men not ordained. There are recorded instances of worthless men and women having by a strong expression made such an impression on the person addressed, as effectually to awaken him to a sense of the need of conversion. Mimics have even done these things. How much more, men coming in the name of GOD and believing themselves duly authorized to minister in holy things, upon persons sincerely receiving them as such? We are told to be ready to give a reason for the hope that is in us. If in so doing we should be enabled to speak with such effect, although in private conversation, as to convince the querist, should we therefore conceive this success as a proof that we are justifiable in ministering in holy things? By no means. Many instances can be produced of both men and women having thus been the means of converting friends. But what was the ancient practice in such cases?

493. Frumentius was taken prisoner by some inhabitants of India when very young. He obtained by degrees great favour with them, and high office. He then sought among the Roman traders for some Christians, and having found some, met with them to pray. Some of the inhabitants of the country joined them. When the number of Christians had considerably increased, and they had built a house for prayer, Frumentius determined to return to his own country; but on arriving in a Christian country, he made it his first business to see a Bishop and beg him to send some one to take charge of the rising Church in India. This was the Bishop of Alexandria in Egypt, Athanasius; who thinking no one more suitable for the office than Frumentius himself, insisted that he should take the charge, and ordained him Bishop; and he returned to India.[1]

If this man had acted upon the principle above mentioned, he would have proceeded to officiate, and to ordain ministers as they might be wanted. And he would have had the same right; for all men stand upon the same footing with regard to doing that which they are not authorized to do.

494. This passage, in Socrates, confirms the view given above (§453) of the meaning of the expression, *Episcopi et Cleri.* Frumentius begged Athanasius to send ἐπίσκοπόν τε καὶ κλῆρον, a Bishop, to India. Athanasius conferred the episcopate on him, says the author, and he returned to India. This was likewise another instance of a layman being made a Bishop at one step. (See §484.)

---

1 *Eccles. Hist.* SOCRATIS, Book I. Ch. xix.; RUFFIN. Book I. Ch. ix.; THEODORET, Book I. Ch. xxii.; SOZOMEN, Book II. Ch. xxiv.

Digitized by Google

Moreover Sozomen and Ruffin in stating the application of Frumentius, use the word *Episcopum* alone, and Theodoret uses language equivalent to it. They all say Frumentius was ordained Bishop, and returned to India, and neither of them mentions any person accompanying him.

495. Let these suffice for a specimen of the concessions of Episcopalians, some of which have been misrepresented, some partially stated, some founded on misapprehended statements and opinions of Jerome, and some influenced by fear or affection, and which, after all, are mere opinions.

The influence of these political and religious considerations is strongly expressed by Bishop Taylor, a man of very great reputation. The following extract is from his works, (Vol. VII. p. 138.)

"But then are all ordinations invalid which are done by mere Presbyters, without a Bishop? What think we of the Reformed Churches?

"For my part I know not what to think. The question hath been so often asked, with so much violence and prejudice, and we are so bound, *by public interest*, to approve all that they do, that we have disabled ourselves to justify our own. For we were glad, at first, of abettors against the errors of the Roman Church; we found these men zealous in it; we thanked God for it, as we had cause; and we were willing to make them recompense, by endeavouring to justify their ordinations; not thinking what would follow upon ourselves. But now it is come to that issue, that our own episcopacy is thought not necessary, because we did not condemn the ordination of their presbytery.

"Why is not the question rather, what we think of the primitive Church, than what we think of the Reformed Churches? Did the primitive Councils and fathers do well in condemning the ordinations made by mere Presbyters? If they did well, what was a virtue in them, is no sin in us."

496. Let us now turn our attention, for a moment, to the concessions of Presbyterian writers, which, instead of being mere opinions upon a question, at best doubtful, how far a departure from the established order of the Church may be deemed excusable; consist of admissions of the fact that episcopacy was established by the Apostles. Some of those now to be mentioned admit this fully and explicitly; others make admissions equivalent to it.

497. Blondel's concession has been already mentioned, (§162:) viz. that the Church was episcopal in Alexandria, Rome, and Jerusalem, in the year 140, eight years before the death of Polycarp, who was appointed by John, Bishop of Smyrna; and consequently must have been so in the days of the Apostles, (§357.)

498. "Peter Moulin, an eminent French theologian, in a book purposely written in defence of the presbyterian government, expressly says, 'Truly this (the episcopal) form of government, all Churches every where received; i. e. presently after the Apostles' times, or even in their time, as ecclesiastical history witnesseth; and the very learned and pious Beausobre, another learned French Protestant divine, admits that forty years after the apostolic era, the government by Bishops prevailed in the Church."[m]

m *Episcopal Magazine for* 1821, Philad. p. 12.

Digitized by Google

499. The same writer also quotes the concession of Mosheim, who was opposed to episcopacy, in the original: the translation is given literally, in Section 113, from the same passage in another book.[n]

500. "Baxter, as quoted by Bishop Hoadley, acknowledges that there were fixed Bishops in the time of St. John. Doddridge, as quoted by Chandler,[o] admits that the distinction between Bishop and Presbyter has been as ancient as the time of St. Ignatius;" (who was contemporary with the Apostle John, (§356) "and Le Clerc, a divine of the Church of Holland, as quoted by the Bishop of Lincoln) says, 'I have always professed to believe that episcopacy is of apostolical institution, and consequently very good; and that man had no manner of right to change it in any place, unless it was impossible otherwise to reform the abuses that crept into Christianity.' Grotius also was of the same opinion with Le Clerc, as appears from his *Annotations on the Consultations of Cassander*, Article xiv.; and from testimonies concerning him annexed to his book *De Veritate*, &c."[p]

501. Grotius, in his note on Acts xxi. 18, (*And the day following Paul went in with us unto James, and all the Elders were present*,) makes the following observation: "He of the Apostles who was at Jerusalem, performed the office which afterwards the Bishops did, and therefore called together the Presbyters: unless perhaps this James was the brother of the LORD, not the Apostle, but the Bishop."[q]

Here is a complete admission that the Bishops were over the Presbyters; that the Apostles performed the episcopal office; and that James, the brother of our LORD, who was not one of the twelve, was Bishop of Jerusalem; agreeing with the declarations of the ancients, that the Apostles ordained *this James* Bishop of Jerusalem. (See §243, 326, 380.)

502. This celebrated man was an active member of the Church of Holland, was publicly employed by it in promoting the reformation in that country, and wrote largely on religion. Although a Presbyterian, his work on church government, (entitled *De Imperio Summarum Potestatum circa Sacra Commentarius Posthumus*,) has many passages, in which are plainly conceded the substance of the argument; or rather the argument itself. The following extracts are translated from that work.

503. Speaking of choosing those who should attend Councils, he says, the brethren at Antioch sent certain of their number with Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem, and in turn the Presbyters and Church of Jerusalem, together with the Apostles, sent persons chosen out of their company to Antioch.

"But in every following age I find no example of an election made by the

n *Episc. Mag.* p. 13.

o CHANDLER'S *Appeal*, p. 20; DODDRIDGE'S *Lectures*, p 498.

p BOWDEN'S *Letters*, p. 159, 160, [Vol. I. p. 77, 78, 2d *ed.*]

q "Qui Apostolorum Hierosolymis erat, is munere fungebatur quo postea Episcopi, ideoque Presbyteros convocabat: nisi forte Jacobus hic fuit frater Domini, non Apostolus, sed Episcopus.

Digitized by Google

Church. For all the Presbyters came together at the Diocesan Councils, all the Bishops at the Metropolitan, except those whom pressing necessity detained. Therefore there was here no election, except that the Bishops seem to have taken, at their own pleasure, Presbyters and Deacons to the Metropolitan."[r]

504. "But ordination was never performed except by Pastors, and indeed anciently by the Bishops alone. Hence Paul, writing to the first Bishop of the Ephesians, admonishes him, (1 Tim. v. 22,) *Lay hands suddenly on no man.* And the most ancient Canons, which are called apostolical, command *that a Presbyter be ordained by a Bishop, but that a Bishop be not (ordained,) except by two or three Bishops.*"[s]

505. "But let us likewise see about the election of Bishops, which is of so much greater importance, as greater care of the Church was conceded to Bishops than to mere Presbyters."[t]

506. "And the ancient Church thought otherwise, which permitted the election of Presbyters to the Bishop, but that of the Bishop to the other Bishops of the province."[u]

507. The second Section of the eleventh chapter is headed thus:

"The word *Bishop* is explained, and is shown in this question to signify a Pastor, who presides over Pastors by a certain perpetual right."

508. He then proceeds thus:

"We treat in the first place of Bishops, which word it is lawful for us to use in that signification, in which the general and local Councils, and all the fathers, are found perpetually using it." After showing that the word was used by several nations as the title of an office superintending various concerns, he adds: "Nor could it be applied with a less proper and peculiar right, to those who with the rest of the whole flock, were appointed *overseers* likewise over the rest of the Pastors themselves. Wherefore they waste their own and other people's time, who, when they undertake to treat this question, laboriously prove that the name of Bishop was common to all Pastors, when the meaning of that word is very plain. Neither do they beat the air less, who make a great effort to prove that certain things are altogether common to all Presbyters, *viz.* the right of preaching, of administering the sacraments, and if any thing belongs to these. For superiority is not sought for in those things in which they agree, but in that which distinguishes them. But that is even a little more absurd, that some, in order to prove that Bishops were not different from mere Presbyters, adduce the fathers saying, *All Bishops are of equal merit:* as if you should say, *All the Roman Senators were equal to the Consuls,* because the dignity of *both Consuls was the same;* but he will make himself or his reader angry, who refutes such things."[v]

509. "Of the episcopate, therefore, that is, the superiority of one Pastor above the rest, we first determine that it is repugnant to no divine law. If any one think otherwise, that is, if any one condemn the whole ancient Church of folly, or even of impiety, the burden of proof beyond doubt lies upon him;" &c. "The very ministry instituted by the Apostles sufficiently proves that equality of the ecclesiastical offices was not commanded by CHRIST. We therefore first lay down this, which is undoubtedly true, that it" (*viz.* the episcopate or superiority of one Pastor above the rest) "neither can nor

r Chap. vii, Sect. 9, 10.
s Chap. x. Sect. 2.
t *Ibid.* Sect. 11.
u *Ibid.* Sect. 13.
v Chap. xi. Sect. 11.

Digitized by Google

ought to be found fault with; in which we have agreeing with us, Zanchius, Chemnitius, Hemmingius, Calvin, Melancthon, Bucer, nay even Beza, as thus far he says, *that one certain person chosen by the judgment of the rest of his co-presbyters was* CHIEF (προεστως, præpositus) *over the Presbytery and was permanently so.*" w

510. "Another is, that that episcopate, which we treat of, was received by the universal Church. This appears from all the Councils, whose authority now likewise is very great among the pious. It appears also from an examination of the Councils either National or Provincial, of which there is almost none which does not show manifest signs of episcopal superiority. All the fathers, without exception, testify the same, of whom he who shows the least deference to the episcopate is Jerome, himself not a Bishop, but a Presbyter. Therefore the testimony of him alone is sufficient: *It was decreed through the whole world, that one chosen from the Presbyters should be set over the rest, to whom all care of the Church should belong.*" "Indeed this error of Aerius was condemned by the whole Church, that he said *that a Presbyter ought to be distinguished from a Bishop by no difference.* Jerome himself in reply to him, who had written *that there is no difference between a Bishop and a Presbyter*, answered, *this is unskilfully enough, to make shipwreck in port, as it is said.* Even Zanchius acknowledges the agreement of the whole Church in this matter." x

511. "The third thing is this, that the episcopate had its commencement in the time of the Apostles. The catalogues of the Bishops in Irenæus, Eusebius, Socrates, Theodoret, and others, all of which begin in the apostolic age, testify this. But to refuse credit in a historical matter to so great authors, and so unanimous among themselves, is not the part of any but an irreverent and stubborn disposition. For that is just as if you should deny that it was true, what all the histories of the Romans declare, that the consulate began from the expelled Tarquins. But let us hear Jerome again; *At Alexandria*, he says, *from Mark the Evangelist the Presbyters always named one chosen from themselves, placed in a higher degree, Bishop.* Mark died in the eighth year of Nero: to whom, succeeded Anianus, to Anianus Abilius, to Abilius Cerdo, the Apostle John being yet alive. After the death of James, Simeon had the episcopate of Jerusalem; after the death of Peter and Paul, Linus, Anacletus, and Clemens had the Roman; and Evodius and Ignatius that of Antioch, the same Apostle still living. This ancient history is surely not to be despised, to which Ignatius himself, the contemporary of the Apostles, and Justin Martyr and Irenæus, who followed him next, afford the most open testimony, which there is no need to transcribe. *Now indeed*, says Cyprian, *Bishops are appointed in all the Provinces and in every City.*" y

512. "Let the fourth be, that this Bishop was approved of by the divine law, or (as Bucer says) it seemed good to the HOLY SPIRIT that one among the Presbyters should have special charge. The divine Revelation affords to this assertion an argument not to be withstood: for CHRIST himself commands it to be written *to the seven Angels* of the Asiatic *Churches.* Those who understand the Churches themselves by *the Angels*, manifestly contradict the sacred writings. For *the* CANDLESTICKS *are the Churches*, says CHRIST, *but the stars are the Angels of the seven Churches.* It is wonderful, whither the humour of contradicting may not carry men, when they dare to confound those things which the HOLY SPIRIT so evidently distinguishes. We do not deny that the name of *angel* may be suited to every pastor in a certain general signification: but here it is manifestly written to one in every Church. Was there therefore only one pastor in every city? No indeed.

---

w Chap. xi. Sect. 3. x *Ibid.* Sect. 4. y *Ibid.* Sect. 5.

Digitized by Google

For even in Paul's time many Presbyters were appointed at Ephesus to *feed the* Church of GOD.[w] Why, therefore, are letters sent to one person in every Church, if no one had a certain peculiar and eminent function?" After showing that some of the ancient fathers, and among the Reformers, Bullinger, Marlorat, Beza, Rainoldus, agree with him in this representation, he says: "CHRIST, therefore, writing to those Bishops, thus eminent among the clergy, undoubtedly approved of this episcopal superiority."

Grotius then quotes a number of the ancient fathers—most of those quoted in Section 56, with several others—to show that Timothy was Bishop of Ephesus and Titus Bishop of Crete; and proceeds thus: "Neither indeed does antiquity declare that to be true, which some now boldly affirm, that they who were Evangelists could not be Bishops. For as long as they traversed provinces, they performed the office of Evangelists; but when beholding a plentiful harvest in one place, they believed it should be cherished by their continual presence, without doubt presiding in the Presbytery, they fulfilled all the duties of Bishops. On which account antiquity declares that Apostles likewise were truly Bishops of certain cities: to wit, in those places, where they remained longer than common, or, that I may speak more properly, where *they sat*. By which word Luke very emphatically expresses the continuance of Paul with the Corinthians.[x] But we read that besides Timothy and Titus, others likewise were advanced by the Apostles to the episcopal dignity. Ignatius writes thus to the Church of Antioch about Evodius: *who was first ordained by the Apostles your Bishop.*" "This is that Ignatius *who saw* CHRIST *in the flesh, lived with the Apostles*, and obtained the episcopate in the Church of Antioch after Evodius."[y]

513. "It may be asked, seeing that the office of those who presided over the Presbyters by a certain perpetual dignity, was so ancient and likewise approved of by CHRIST himself, by what name was that honour called before that common name of Bishops began to be applied peculiarly to this presidency? which Jerome thinks happened about the eighth year of Nero.[z] The ancient fathers think that these Chiefs of the Presbyters (*hos Presbyterorum Principes*) were called *Apostles*." "The Revelation shows that the name of *Angel* was anciently given to him, who afterwards began to be called *Bishop*." "By this name Justin Martyr calls the *Bishop* in his *Second Apology*."[a]

514. The ninth Section of this Chapter (chap. xi.) of Grotius is headed thus: "Great advantages redounded to the Church from the episcopate." He then proceeds to say:

"But moreover we may lay down this, that great advantages redounded, to the Church from the episcopate: The history of all ages proclaims this: but I will again use that witness, who of all antiquity least favoured Bishops

---

w Acts xx. 17, 18.

x Acts xviii. 11. Note; The word spoken of above, is ἐκάθισε, *he sat*, (from καθίζω,) translated in our Testament by the word *continued*.

y Chapter xi. Sect. 6.—See §356, note.

z Nero began to reign in the year 54, and died in the year 68. His eighth year, therefore, was in the year 62. At this time Mark was succeeded by Anianus in the bishopric of Alexandria; (§390; John the Apostle lived forty years after this, until the accession of the fourth Bishop of Alexandria after Mark, (§391;) and Paul and Peter several years after. (See EUSEB. *Eccles. Hist.* Book II. Chap. xxiv. xxv.) Observe the agreement between this and the argument maintained in Sections 222, 225, 226, 243, 267 to 269. GROTIUS's work I had no knowledge of, perhaps never heard of; and was led to consult him by BOWDEN's reference to him, mentioned in Section 501.

a Chap. xi. Sect. 7.

Digitized by Google

that is Jerome: He says, (*In Tit.* cap. i.) 'It was decreed through the whole world, that one chosen from the Presbyters should be set over the rest to take away schisms and dissensions.' The same elsewhere (*adv. Lucif.*) says: 'The safety of the Church depends upon the dignity of the Chief Priest, that is of the Bishop, to whom if a certain independent power be not given, and by all, there will be made as many schisms in the Church as Priests.'[b] Neither is that different which Cyprian so many times inculcates: 'Whence have schisms and heresies arisen, and whence do they arise still, unless when the Bishop, who is one and presides over the Church, is despised by the proud presumption of some?' And elsewhere: 'Neither indeed have heresies arisen, or schisms sprung, from any other quarter than this, that obedience is not paid to the Priest of God, neither is there chosen one Priest and a Judge in the place of Christ, at a time in the Church.' Neither indeed are single Churches only fortified against schisms by the presidency of one, but, as the same Cyprian says, 'The whole Church is connected together by the chain of Priests adhering to one another.' For the concord of the whole world was kept up by the correspondence of the (Churches) built up, through the Bishops. And so much for episcopal eminence."

515. The reader who will compare these extracts with the grounds taken by Dr. Miller and Lord King in their argument for the validity of presbyterian ordination, will discover that they are completely demolished by Grotius, indeed that he treats them with contempt.[c]

He may, however, after reading these concessions, be disposed, if not to doubt whether Grotius was in reality a Presbyterian, at least to ask, on what grounds he rested his belief in that doctrine. Let him speak for himself.

516. The tenth section of the chapter from which several preceding quotations are taken, is headed thus: "The episcopal superiority is not of divine command:" which he proceeds to establish in the following manner:

"On the other hand, for the equality of Pastors we allege these things, not at all repugnant to the former. First, the episcopal superiority was not of divine command. This is sufficiently proved, because the contrary is not proved: for Christ is no where read to have commanded this; he approved of it indeed in the Revelation, but that which is approved of, is not immediately commanded.[d] The episcopate is of apostolic institution, because it appears that Bishops were ordained or approved of in some Churches

b See the truth of this declaration of Jerome—or the fulfilment of this prophecy, if you please—strikingly illustrated in Dr. Chapman's *Sermons*.

c Compare Sections 508 to 513 with p. 202, 204, &c. and Sections 164, &c. &c. and 428, &c.

d He, however, did appoint the Apostles with power to regulate the Church, saying, *as my Father sent me, so send I you.* (John xx. 21.) They thus therefore were expressly invested with his authority to regulate the Church, and were promised that he would be with them always. They, in execution of the trust reposed in them, appointed Presbyters and conferred upon them a subordinate authority, (§274,) and he approved of what they had done. He did therefore appoint the superior, and did not the inferior officer; but only approved of their appointment. Whatever force therefore there is in Grotius' argument, 'that what is *approved* is not therefore *commanded*,' goes to show that the office of *Presbyter* is not of divine command; but that of the *Apostle* or *Bishop* from whom they immediately derived their appointment, is.

Digitized by Google

by the Apostles; but the Apostles no where commanded that such Bishops should be in every Church.[e] By which distinction we separate the case of Jerome from that of Aerius. Jerome says: 'The Bishops became greater than the Presbyters, more by custom than by the truth of the divine ordering;' as likewise Augustin (*Epist.* xix.) 'The episcopate is greater than the presbyterate in the names of honour, which the practice of the Church hath retained.' When the fathers speak of *custom*, they do not exclude the apostolic institution; nay as Augustine says, 'What the whole Church maintains, and was not instituted by Councils, but was always held, is not with very good reason believed to be handed down by any but apostolical authority.' But, as we have elsewhere said, whatever was instituted by the Apostles is not necessarily of divine command: for many things are instituted, the liberty of changing being retained: we see that the decree in the apostolic Church, that the people should respond *Amen* with a distinct voice; that he who teaches should have his head uncovered; is not observed at the present time in many places.[f] Add also that the Apostles so instituted Bishops, that they left certain Churches without Bishops: Epiphanius acknowledges this: 'There was need of Presbyters and Deacons, for by these two the ecclesiastical offices could be fulfilled; but where there was not found any one worthy of the episcopate, the place remained without a Bishop, but where there was need, and there were persons worthy of the episcopate, Bishops were appointed.' Those Churches therefore,[g] as Jerome says, 'were governed by the common council of Presbyters.' "[h]

517. In the following Section, after showing that in some particular cases there were two Bishops in a city,[i] and that sometimes the episcopal chair (*cathedra episcopalis*) was vacant for months and even for years, during which the Church was necessarily governed by the Presbyters—as an instance of which he quotes the case of the Roman Church in the time of Cyprian, (which, by the by, proves decidedly the inferiority of the Presbyters, see §241,)—Grotius proceeds in the following manner:

"And then all the ancients confess that there was no act so peculiarly the Bishop's, that it might not also be exercised by the Presbyter, except the right of ordaining."

---

e It appears however from the latter part of the Section, that wherever a person was found worthy he was ordained Bishop; and therefore that the intention of the Apostles was to appoint Bishops wherever they could find suitable persons, and consequently every where as soon as they could.

f As to the liberty of changing; whatever was the practice of the Apostles is obligatory on us, unless expressly abrogated. They were inspired men, taught of God, and sent to teach us. What they taught, we are bound to believe; what they did, we are bound to practice.

g They did not however command that the Church should be governed by the common council of Presbyters; neither did they show any intention that it should be so, but the reverse—inasmuch as they appointed a Bishop over them wherever a suitable person could be had.

h *Ibid.* Sect. 10.

i There are a few instances of this mentioned, as when the Jews were numerous in a city, their great prejudice against the Gentiles induced the Apostles to appoint a Bishop for them apart from the latter, (§117.) This, however, continued but a short time. An instance is also mentioned of the Bishop of Antioch at a very advanced age, considerably above an hundred years, taking to himself a coadjutor. (Euseb. *Eccles. Hist.* Book VI. Ch. x.)

Digitized by Google

After quoting Chrysostom and Jerome to show this, he adds:

"But although the right of ordaining is taken away from Presbyters according to the opinion of these fathers, which constitution (or law) may be seen in many Councils Universal and local, what nevertheless hinders that at least we may interpret it so that Presbyters could ordain no one without the Bishop's consent? (*contempto episcopo.*) The fourth Council of Carthage seems to teach that Presbyters in some way or other concurred with the Bishop in ordaining: it says, 'When a Presbyter is ordained, the Bishop blessing him and laying his hand upon his head, all the Presbyters likewise who are present, may lay their hands upon his head, near the hand of the Bishop.' I do not dare to bring in confirmation of this, that expression of Paul's of *the imposition of the hands of the Presbytery*, because I see that Jerome, Ambrose, and other ancients, and Calvin, certainly the chief of all the moderns, interpret πρεσβυτεριον in that place not *an assembly*, but *the office* to which Timothy was promoted: and indeed he who is conversant with the Councils and the writings of the fathers, cannot be ignorant that *Presbyterium*, as *Episcopatus*, and *Diaconatus*, are the names of offices. Add that it appears that Paul laid hands on Timothy. Neither does it seem necessary, nor sufficiently decorous that the assistance of others should be added to the act of an Apostle and the conferring of admirable gifts.[k] Yet I do not see

k Grotius here intimates, but does not pretend to say, that the Presbyters were perhaps permitted with the Bishop's consent to ordain. The utter groundlessness of the claim of Presbyters cannot be more strongly evinced than by this very conjecture. If such a man, in an attempt to establish the parity of Presbyters and Bishops, and to show that the former could do whatever the latter did, at least with their consent, is compelled to rest their claim on conjecture—if he cannot bring forward any case from the history of the primitive Church to show that they had any thing to do with ordaining—if he is compelled to be silent respecting the decisions in the fourth century pronouncing such an act null and void (see §359 to 365)—if he brings forward not a single expression favourable to this claim before the permission of the fourth Council of Carthage which sat in 657, [☞ see the end of this note] and that only permitting Presbyters to lay on hands near the hands of the Bishop when he ordains a Presbyter, and confining the permission to the ordination of a Presbyter—if he does not dare to quote in confirmation of that which he wishes to establish, *the sole sentence* in the New Testament which gives any countenance to this claim; it must be admitted by all who are governed by facts, that it is a groundless claim.

[The following note is transferred to this place from §557, to which it was appended in the first edition of the Essay.]

It was discovered, too late for correction before now, that the fourth Council of Carthage was held earlier than the year 657, but not so early as to affect the argument. The precise year is not stated in any book I can lay my hands upon, although I have consulted a number.* It must, however, at the earliest, have been late in the fourth century, as will appear from the following.

Bishop TAYLOR, speaking of the rule, that Bishops were to be ordained by all the Bishops of the province, or in cases of necessity at least by three, says, this was decreed by the Council of Nice, ratified by the Council of Antioch, decreed also by the Council of Laodicea, and the first and second Council of Arles, "and so we may see it descend through the bowels of *the fourth Council of Carthage* to the inferior ages." (TAYLOR'S *Works*, Vol. VII. p. 118.) The Council of Nice was held when the fourth century was well advanced, and here are a number of others following in succession before the fourth Council of Carthage.

It is to be remembered that the fact of this liberty being then granted, is stated by TAYLOR, by HOOKER, and by GROTIUS. (See TAYLOR'S *Works*, Vol. VII. p. 137;

* [The fourth Council of Carthage was held in the year 398, for the purpose of restoring the ecclesiastical discipline, which had gone to decay during the usurpation of Gildo the Moor. KORTHOLTII *Hist. Eccles.* p. 161.]

Digitized by Google

how that can be refuted, where there are not Bishops, that ordination might be rightly performed even by a Presbyter, when Antisiodorensis among the Scholastics long ago conceded this.[l] Truly those things which are said for the sake of right order, have their exceptions. As in the ancient council of Carthage, in case of necessity it is conceded to Presbyters to reconcile (or absolve) penitents: and elsewhere, to lay hands upon baptized persons.[m]

HOOKER's *Eccles. Polity*, Vol. II. p. 256, and GROTIUS *De Imp. Sum. Pot. circa Sacra*, cap. xi. §11.) That it was then first enjoyed is evident from the following: in the third Council of Carthage a motion was made that if a Church was without a Bishop, she might demand a Presbyter from any Bishop, that he might become her Bishop. It was agreed to; but one asked, What if the Bishop have but one Presbyter? It was replied, that the Bishop could alone ordain as many as he wanted. (TAYLOR'S *Works*, Vol. VII. p. 135.)

It is also to be noted that the liberty granted by the decree of the fourth Council of Carthage, was not a liberty to ordain, but only to lay hands near the hands of the Bishop *when he was ordaining a Presbyter;* and that even this liberty was expressly confined to the ordination of a Presbyter.

It is moreover to be noted that this Council was merely a *Provincial* Council, and that the liberty given by it to Presbyters, was confined for a long time to the Church of Carthage. Thus Taylor says, "Since, therefore, we never find Presbyters joined with Bishops in commission, or practice, or penalty," (penalty for uncanonical ordinations) "all this while; I may infer from the premises, the same thing which the Council of Hispalis expresses in direct and full sentence: 'Episcopus sacerdotibus ac ministris solus honorem dare potest, solus auferre non potest:' 'The Bishop alone may give the priestly honour, he alone is not suffered to take it away.' This council was held in the year 657, and I set it down here for this purpose, to show that the decree of the fourth Council of Carthage, which was the first that licensed Priests to assist Bishops in ordinations, yet was not obligatory in the West; but for almost three hundred years after, ordinations were made by Bishops alone. But till this Council (of Carthage) no pretence of any such conjunction, and after this Council, sole ordination (ordination by the Bishop alone) did not expire in the West for above two hundred years together; but for aught I know, ever since then it hath obtained, that although Presbyters join not in the consecration of a Bishop, yet of a Presbyter they do; but this is only by a positive subintroduced constitution, first made in a provincial (Council) of Africa, and in other places received by insinuation and conformity of practice." (TAYLOR'S *Works*, Vol. VII. p. 137.) This practice, it appears, did not extend to the Eastern Church. In this Church, "At the consecration of a Bishop, several Bishops lay on their hands, together with the Archbishop; but it does not appear from Dr. KING, who gives these offices (of the ordination of Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons,) at full length, that in this Church the attending Presbyters lay on their hands, together with the Bishop, at the ordination of a Presbyter, as is the practice in the Church of England." *Religious World Displayed*, by the Rev. R. ADAM, Vol. I. p. 342.

l In reply to this Grotius' own argument may be used. That they had no authority is sufficiently proved, because the contrary is not proved, (§516;) also, if any one thinks differently, *viz.* that they had authority, undoubtedly the burden of proof lies on him, (§509.) The Scholastics *arose in the twelfth century.*

m Hereby Grotius admits the rule that they could not ordain, and only pleads that there might have been exceptions, as in two other cases he mentions. To which it is replied, that the very nature of an exception to a law requires that it be very clearly and positively laid down; because it is the only plea that can be made for that which without it would be a violation of acknowledged law, while the fact of the exception makes the law the more binding in all cases not excepted. And if the Presbyters were so restricted in these minor matters, how plain it is that a law, respecting a more important matter, without a single exception, is absolute, and binding in all cases—particularly when, in every instance in which it has been departed from, the act has been declared null and void absolutely, without conditions or exceptions. (See §360 to 364.)

With regard to laying hands on baptized persons, or confirming, it is not pretended to have been practised any where but in Egypt; and for that nothing can be produced, I think, but the passage from Hilary or Ambrose in Section 282 (o.)

Digitized by Google

Then, as we have said above, it is doubtful whether Presbyters, who neither have Presbyters under them, nor a Bishop over them, belong to (the order of) Bishops or to (that of) mere Presbyters.—For Ambrose thus argues of Timothy, 'he who had no other before him, was a Bishop.'[n] Indeed (that we may take an example from the republic) many things are lawful to a Senate not having a King, which are not lawful to a Senate constituted under a King. Because a Senate without a King is as it were a King."[o]

518. The following concession is perhaps as remarkable as any that have been mentioned. It is the section immediately following that mentioned above, (§517.)

"We may assert this third thing, that the causes why in the present age in some places the episcopate was omitted certainly for some time, were not light. For Beza himself seems to acknowledge that the causes were temporary, when he says that he was not a person who thought that the old order was not to be restored, *if the ruins of the Church could be restored.*"[h]

Grotius then proceeds to mention these causes, which he says were not light ones. The first is the want of suitable persons to fill so important an office as the episcopate. The second was the long and inveterate corruption of the episcopal office; and of this he admits:

"That good things ought not indeed to be condemned because there are persons who abuse them; but it is not unfrequent that things should be intermitted, when the abuse is turned against the institution."

"A third cause may be added, that in very troublesome times, the teachers of the truth, odious by that name," (*Bishop*) "ought not only to remove the sin of ambition, but even all suspicion, because, when the episcopal dignity being done away, they were very cautious, they did not even, as it was, escape calumny. What would they not have heard, if the change of doctrine had been joined with the acquisition of the higher degree? I will add one cause more, why, in the beginning of the reformation, the episcopate was not for some time necessary. God had raised up excellent men, of the greatest genius, of the greatest erudition, and with no less authority with their neigh-

"Finally, in Egypt Presbyters confirm, if the Bishop is not present;" and this passage is so unconnected with what precedes and follows it, that the moment I read it the suspicion arose that Hilary did not write it. The whole passage is connected without it; with it, the sense is interrupted. This taken together with the fact that no writer has been able to produce a solitary case of confirmation, or a declaration that Presbyters confirmed, (See §445, &c.) shows that they had not the power. Even admitting that Hilary wrote the sentence above mentioned, the very expression shows that the practice was an exception to the general law, which had by some means obtained in Alexandria: and, therefore, shows beyond question that the law of the Church was that Presbyters should not confirm. By the by, these attempts of Presbyterian writers to show that Presbyters anciently had the right to confirm, prove beyond controversy that it was the practice of the Apostles, (§247, &c.)

n There were bishoprics so small as not to require above one or two Presbyters, and in some instances the Bishop had none. (TAYLOR'S *Works*, Vol. VII. p. 228, &c.) These Bishops were not, however, Presbyters, because they had none under them. They differed in having had ordination to the episcopate, a circumstance totally overlooked by Grotius in this Section, if not altogether. Presbyters were, however, sometimes located in villages where there was no Bishop; but they were under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of a neighbouring city. (§397.) What, moreover, was to hinder the candidates for ordination from going to the Bishop when he did not reside in the same city? (See §302 and other Sections.)

o GROTIUS, *de Imp.* cap. xi. Sect. 11.

Digitized by Google

bours than with their own people; few indeed in number, but who were equal to bearing very many things. The great reputation of these among all men easily supplied what was wanting from the episcopate. And (if with Zanchius I will acknowledge the truth) in reality no men were Bishops more than those very men whose authority availed to oppose even the episcopate. Nor is that to be omitted here, which we have several times said, that the ecclesiastical regimen for the most part takes something from the civil form (of government.)—In the Roman Empire, Bishops answered to Commanders; Metropolitans to Presidents; Patriarchs or Primates to Lieutenants.—Why, therefore, is it wonderful if the people, more accustomed to the government of Noblemen than of one (a King) commit the affairs of the Church to clergymen more willingly than to a Bishop? And indeed on account of these causes the Churches which have no Bishops, seem to me to be excusable, provided, however, that they abstain from disapproving of a most sacred institution, and at the same time, retain that which Beza, in these words, (*On the Degrees of the Evangelical Ministry*, Chap. xxiii.) thinks is by no means to be omitted: 'It was essential, that by the perpetual ordination of God, it was, it is, and will be necessary, that some one in the Presbytery, Chief both in place and dignity, should preside to govern the proceedings, with that right which is given to him by God.' "[p]

519. The reader will remark in these extracts, that it is expressly admitted that the episcopate, or office of Bishop, had its commencement in the time of the Apostles, and was received by the Universal Church; (§498, 500, 501, 504, 509, 510, 511, 512, latter paragraph;) that the institution was approved of by the divine law, that it seemed good to the Holy Spirit, and that our Lord Jesus Christ 'writing to those Bishops, thus eminent among the clergy, undoubtedly approved of this episcopal superiority,' (§512 first paragraph;) that all antiquity proclaimed the advantages derived from it, (§514;) and that those of the reformers who had formed a Church without Bishops, had done so because of the prejudice that had arisen from the institution; because they feared the charge of ambition if they had retained the order of Bishops; and, having all the power and influence of the office, whereby they regulated the affairs of the Church so as to keep it in a prosperous state, and not having, in the beginning, a sufficient number of suitable men to fill as many bishoprics as there ought to have been, they determined to discontinue the office for a time; declaring that it ought to be restored as soon as it could be, (§518, &c.) These were not the sentiments of Grotius only, but he quotes the most celebrated reformers as agreeing with him, and closes with a passage from one of the most vehement opposers of episcopacy as it then existed in the Church of Rome, which fully admits the necessity of one ruler in every Church presiding by divine right and the perpetual ordination of God. (§518.)

520. This is not a bare admission. It is a strong argument by one of the most celebrated writers of Europe, by which he is led to conclusions totally opposed to the doctrines of the Presbyte-

p Grotius, *de Imp.* Cap. xi Sect. 12. I shall endeavour to give some of these passages in the original at the close.

Digitized by Google

rian Churches of the present day. Those able and learned men who feared to encounter the charge of ambition in supporting what they acknowledged to be the ancient apostolical order of the Church, and thought to discontinue for a time an office, the institution of which seemed good to the HOLY SPIRIT, and which was expressly approved of by our LORD himself, certainly acted upon the principle, though none of them might have been aware of it, that evil may be done that good may come of it. They did not sufficiently consider the excessive difficulty of doing away errors in which people have been born and bred.

521. The reader is requested to note also the exceeding slenderness of the argument for the parity of Presbyters and Bishops. *The episcopate was not of divine* COMMAND, though it is admitted to have been instituted by men divinely inspired and directed, and to have been expressly *approved of* by our LORD JESUS CHRIST. How can any man say that they had not a divine command for it? Did this institution, so admirable as to seem good to the HOLY SPIRIT and to be *approved of* expressly by our SAVIOUR himself, not occur to *them*, and yet to *men?*

522. 'The episcopate was instituted by the Apostles, but they did not *command* that Bishops should be every where appointed; and they left some Churches without them, that is, they left them under Presbyters, and therefore those Churches were governed by Presbyters.' But they did appoint Bishops wherever they could find a suitable person, and consequently they intended to appoint them *every where*, as soon as suitable persons could be found.

523. As to the powers of Presbyters, Grotius grants that according to the fathers, they could not ordain; but conjectures that they might nevertheless do so with the Bishop's consent. In support of which all he advances is, that in the year 657,[q] they were permitted to lay on hands, *in the ordination of a Presbyter*, near the hands of a Bishop. He says nothing about the decisions in the fourth century, declaring null and void not only ordinations by Presbyters, but even one in which a Presbyter read the words of ordination for a blind Bishop while he laid his hands on the head of the candidate. And lastly, he formally gives up the only case in which it is pretended that Presbyters laid on hands in ordination before the year 657;[q] excepting those which were declared illegal in the fourth century, (§360—365,) and another in the sixth. He says he does not dare to quote the ordination of Timothy as a case in which Presbyters officiated—admitting with Calvin, &c. &c. that the word translated *Presbytery* signifies *the office* conferred on Timothy.

524. In short, the sum of his argument for the parity of Presbyters and Bishops is, that although the Apostles, who were inspired men commissioned to regulate the Church, instituted the episcopate or office of Bishop, and what they did *seemed good* to the HOLY SPIRIT and was expressly *approved* by our LORD

q [In the year 398.]

Digitized by Google

JESUS CHRIST, yet the institution is not a divine COMMAND: that although the Apostles appointed Bishops wherever they could find suitable men, yet they did not *command* them to be appointed in every Church, and left some Churches to be governed by Presbyters: and that, although there is express authority for the declaration that Presbyters did not ordain, *perhaps* they might have sometimes done so, by permission of the Bishop; as in the year 657[r] they were permitted to lay their hands near the hands of the Bishop while he was blessing (ordaining) the candidate.

Such an argument from such a man is equivalent to a total surrender of the question.

525. It may be remarked here also that Grotius admits the truth of several interesting facts mentioned in the preceding pages: *viz.* that James the brother of our LORD, was Bishop of Jerusalem, (§501, 511;) Timothy, of Ephesus, (§504;) and Titus, of Crete, and Ignatius of Antioch, (§512;) also that the Angels of the seven Churches were the Bishops of those Churches, (§512;) that the Bishops were pastors who presided over the other pastors by a perpetual right, (§507;) and says that they waste their time who try to 'prove that the name of Bishop was common to all pastors, (§508;) and that this Chief (*Princeps*) of the Presbyters was first called *Apostle* and *Angel*, and finally the title of *Bishop* was given to him, Jerome thought about the eighth year of Nero;[s] that is, before the death of Peter and Paul, and about forty years before that of John, (§513.)

526. Grotius also mentions the names of a number of the principal reformers as agreeing with him. The following extracts are from the writings of two of these.

Melancthon says, "I would to GOD it lay in me to restore the government of Bishops. For I see what manner of Church we shall have, the ecclesiastical polity being dissolved. I do see that hereafter there will grow up a greater tyranny in the Church than there ever was before."[t]

527. We shall close with an extract from Calvin. Grotius mentions his name among those who agreed with him, that the episcopate, or superiority of one pastor above the rest, neither could nor ought to be found fault with, (§509.)

528. Calvin in his Institutes speaks thus on this subject:

"They named all those on whom was enjoined the office of teaching, *Presbyters*. These chose one of their number in every city, to whom in particular they gave the title of *Bishop*; lest from equality, as usually happens, dissensions should arise. Yet the Bishop was not so superior in honour and dignity, that he had dominion over his colleagues: but those duties which a Consul performs in the Senate, that he may report concerning matters, collect their opinions, go before others in consulting, admonishing, exhorting, regulate the whole proceedings by his own authority, and execute what may have been determined in common council; that office the

r [In the year 398.]

s See §267, 225, 226.

t Apol. Aug. Con. p. 305. BOWDEN'S *Letters*, Vol. III. p. 367, [Vol. II. p. 174, 2d *ed.*]

Digitized by Google

Bishop sustained in the assembly of Presbyters. And the ancients themselves confess that it was introduced by human agreement through the necessity of the times. Thus Jerome, *on the Epistle to Titus*, says: 'A Presbyter is the same as a Bishop. And before that by the instigation of the devil dissensions were made in religion, and it was said among the people, *I am of Paul, I of Cephas*, the Churches were governed by the common council of Presbyters. Afterwards, that the seeds of dissensions might be taken away, the whole charge was committed to one. As therefore the Presbyters know that they are subject, by the custom of the Church, to him who is over them; so the Bishops may have known that they are superior to the Presbyters, more by custom than by the LORD's appointment, and ought to govern the Church in common.'[u] He elsewhere, however, teaches how ancient the institution was. For he says, at Alexandria, from Mark the Evangelist to Heraclas and Dionysius, the Presbyters always placed one chosen from themselves in a higher degree, whom they called Bishop."—"To every city was allotted a certain region, which received its Presbyters from thence, and was added to the body of that Church. Every college (as I have said) was subject to one Bishop, for the sake of government only and preserving peace: who so exceeded others in dignity, that he was subject to the assembly of the brethren. But if the tract of country which was in his bishopric was so large that he could not fulfil all the duties of a Bishop, Presbyters were appointed in certain places through that country, who should discharge his duty in minor matters."[v]

529. In this passage Calvin fully admits the main facts contended for by Episcopalians.

He admits that there were Bishops. He indeed asserts that the Bishop only executed the duties of a Consul in a Senate, and was the executive officer of the Church, and foremost in every thing. But this limitation is asserted without any kind of testimony offered to support it. This is not the kind of authority that Paul had in view when he said, *These things command and teach. Let no man despise thy youth. Them* (presbyters) *that sin rebuke before all, that the rest also may fear. Lay hands suddenly on no man.* Nor such as is represented in the Epistles of Ignatius,[w] nor in any of the fathers; not even in Jerome.[x]

530. Calvin also admits that it was found necessary to set a Bishop over the Presbyters to put an end to dissensions; and although he asserts (without even Jerome's authority) that this

---

u With regard to the assertion that *a Presbyter is the same as a Bishop*, JEROME, according to Dr. MILLER, does not make it. The words of JEROME, according to Dr. MILLER, are not an assertion, but an inference from some preceding observations on the Epistle to Titus: 'a Presbyter therefore is the same as a Bishop.' MILLER's *Letters*, p. 180, [p. 118, 2d *ed.*] This could not have been an assertion respecting the order of the Church in JEROME's day, because it was noteriously otherwise. (§153, 154, 247, 266.) If it had been an assertion respecting the order of the Church in former times, it must rest on the testimony of some who then lived. But Jerome produces none, and could not have produced any, if he had desired it. He only *inferred* it, and he himself calls it *an opinion*. (§237.) He did not then *confess it*, as Calvin says.

v CALVIN's *Institutes*, Book IV. ch. iv. §2.

w See italic lines in Appendix.

x See the third and the following quotations from Jerome in Section 154; also §247, &c. and 266.

Digitized by Google

was by human agreement, he allows that it was done from the time of Mark, who died before Peter and Paul, and forty years before John;[y] consequently it was by the authority of the Apostles that the Bishops were set over the Churches: and Jerome, his sole authority, admits that they appointed James, Mark, Titus, and Timothy, Bishops, (§243, 389, note;) and James was appointed not long after the commencement of the public preaching of the Gospel;[z] and Timothy before Paul went to Rome at all, (§14—21.) It was therefore not by mere human authority; but being done by the authorized agents of God, under the influence, too, of his Holy Spirit, and afterwards expressly approved of by our Lord Jesus Christ, (§512,) episcopacy was divinely instituted. If this be not the act of God, then no act done by an authorized agent and afterwards ratified, can be considered the act of the principal.

531. He admits moreover in the same passage, (§528,) that the Bishop had under him a certain region round about the city, and Presbyters were designated to minister to the people of that region, who discharged his duty in minor matters.

532. He admits also in Section 15 of the same Chapter, that Bishops were ordained by Bishops; and that every Bishop ordained his own Presbyters, with the college of Presbyters.[a] With regard to the assertion that the Bishop, with the college of Presbyters, ordained his Presbyters, he offers no testimony, and no more need be said to show that he could bring none before the year 657,[b] than to remark that Grotius could refer to no such case, (§517;) nor could Lord King, (§456, &c.) nor can any man; and therefore this assertion of Calvin is unfounded.

533. Calvin therefore admits that Bishops in the days of the Apostles, were set over the Presbyters of the Church; that each city and the neighbouring country, with the Presbyters who ministered to the inhabitants, were under one Bishop; and that the Bishop was ordained by other Bishops, but that he ordained his own Presbyters; aided, Calvin says, by the other Presbyters; without foundation, however, before the year 657.[c] In this he admits, moreover, a second ordination which involves a superior order, necessarily.[d]

534. The circumstances which Calvin has added, in order to make this system agree with that in which the ministers are all equal, he asserts entirely without authority or testimony. He does not pretend to produce any to support the assertion that the Bishop was no more than the president of the council of Pres-

y Note to §513.

z See the manner in which James is mentioned in Acts xii. 17; xv. 13; xxi. 18: Galat. i. 19: always present, always presiding, first mentioned on every remarkable occasion—certainly James had something more to do with the Church of Jerusalem than any other person, though he was not one of the twelve. James who was one of the twelve was killed by Herod; Acts xii. 2.

a Sed suos Presbyteros quisque Episcopus cum Presbyterorum collegio ordinabat. Lib. IV. c. iv. §15.

b [Before the year 398.]

c See §517 note k.

d See §263.

Digitized by Google

byters. The only passage quoted is brought forward to show the origin of this arrangement, *viz.* that it 'was introduced by human agreement;' and the only one referred to, destroys even this, by showing that Bishops were in being in the time of the Apostles; and consequently are of divine institution, (§530.) The passage quoted from Jerome, so far from supporting Calvin's assertion that, 'the Bishop was nothing more than the president of the common council of Presbyters,' proves the very reverse. '*Before* the dissensions spoken of, the Churches were governed by a *common council of Presbyters; afterwards* the whole charge was committed to *one*,' says Jerome. Consequently, *when* the charge was committed to *one*, the *common council* was done away. The common council, if it ever existed, *must* have had a president in order to do business, and when it was done away, and *the Presbyters made subject to the Bishop*, as Jerome in the same quotation says, (§528,) the president of the council went with it. Jerome's words, so far therefore from representing the Bishop as the common council of Presbyters, show that the president ceased to be president, and with the rest of the Presbyters became subject to the Bishop, when he was appointed by the Apostles. With what powers the Bishop was clothed, according to Jerome, may be seen in Sections 154, 247, 256, 257, 266.

535. It is evident from these extracts that the *continental* reformers admitted that the primitive Church was episcopal, (§519) that they considered the intermission of the episcopal office as temporary, (§518) that one of them wished it restored, (§526) another said that a substitute for the episcopal office was essential, (end of §518,) and that he was not the man who thought the old order ought not to be restored if it could be. (§518.)

536. As to the *English* reformers, they retained the episcopate; and although great dissensions arose among them which terminated in the separation of many from the Church under the name of Puritans, since called Dissenters, their differences commenced while they were in exile on the continent; and the separation was produced by the refusal of the latter to wear the habits and use the ceremonies of the Church, and not on account of the office of Bishop.

537. Neal in his *History of the Puritans* states, that the English exiles were most numerous at Frankfort; that on application to the Magistrates they were allowed to use the French Church, on condition that 'they should subscribe the French confession of faith and not quarrel about ceremonies;' that after consultation they agreed 'not to answer aloud after the minister, nor to use the Litany and surplice;' that they used the order of service as set forth by King Edward, excepting the omission of the Litany and responses; that John Knox was at this time their minister; that in this state of things Dr. Cox, a clergyman, who had been tutor to King Edward, went to Frankfort, and during the service on Sunday responded aloud, and on the following

Digitized by Google

Sunday one of his friends took possession of the pulpit and read the whole Litany; and that in consequence of this, great contentions arose, which terminated in the departure of John Knox from Frankfort.[e] This Neal calls "the first breach or schism between the English exiles on account of the service book of King Edward; which made way for the distinction, by which the two parties were afterwards known, of PURITANS and CONFORMISTS."[f]

538. He says that when the exiles returned, on the accession of Elizabeth:

"Their learned friends and patrons beyond sea, advised them to go through with the reformation, and clear the Church *of all the relics of Popery and superstition at once;*" that letters of this character were written "by Gualter, one of the chief divines of Zurich," "by the learned Bullinger, Peter Martyr, and Weidner, to the Earl of Bedford, who had been some time at Zurich, and to Jewel, Sandys, Horn, Cox, Grindal, and the rest of the late exiles, pressing them vehemently to act with zeal and courage, and to take care in the first beginnings to have *all things* settled upon sure and sound foundations. The exiles in their answers seemed resolved to follow their advice, and make a bold stand for *a thorough reformation;* and if they had done so they might have obtained it. Jewel, in his letter of May 22, 1559, thanks Bullinger for quickening their zeal and courage; and adds, 'They were doing what they could; and that all things were coming into a better state.' In another of April 10, 'He laments the want of zeal and industry in promoting the reformation; and that things were managed in so slow and cautious a manner, as if the word of GOD was not to be received on his own authority.' In another of November 16, 'He complains of the Queen's keeping a crucifix in her Chapel, with lighted candles; that there was worldly policy in this, which he did not like: That all things were so loose and uncertain with them, that he did not know whether he should not be obliged to return back to Zurich. He complains of the Popish vestments, which he calls the relics of the Amorites, and wishes they were extirpated to the deepest roots.' The like complaints were made by Cox, Grindal, Horn, Pilkington, and others; but they had not the resolution to persevere: had they united counsels, and stood by one another, they might at this juncture have obtained the removal of *those grievances which afterwards occasioned the separation.*"[g]

539. Neal has more to the same purpose. Respecting the act of Elizabeth, entitled "An Act for the Uniformity of Common Prayer and Service in the Church, and Administration of the Sacraments," he speaks as follows.

"Upon this fatal rock of uniformity in things merely indifferent (in the opinion of the imposers) was the peace of the Church of England split. The pretence was decency and order; but it seems a little odd that uniformity should be necessary to the decent worship of GOD, when in most other things there is a greater beauty in variety. It is not necessary to a decent dress that men's clothes should be always of the same colour and fashion; nor would there be any indecorum or disorder, if in one congregation the

e NEAL'S *History*, Vol. I. p. 150 to 153.
f *Ibid.* p. 155.
g *Ibid.* p. 164, 165.

Digitized by Google

Sacrament should be administered kneeling, in another sitting, and in a third standing; or if in one and the same congregation the minister were at liberty to read prayers either in a black gown or a surplice, supposing the garments to be indifferent, which the makers of this law admitted, though the Puritans denied. The rigorous pressing of this act was the occasion of all the mischiefs that befel the Church for above eighty years."[h]

540. The reader will observe that there is not a word here against the episcopal order of the Church. On the contrary, he says:

"Several of the reformed exiles were offered bishoprics, but refused them, *on account of the habits and ceremonies*, &c. as Mr. Whitehead, Mr. Bernard Gilpin, old father Miles Coverdale, Mr. Knox, Mr. Thomas Sampson, and others. Many who accepted did it with trembling; from the necessity of the times, and in hopes by their interest with the Queen to obtain an amendment in the constitution of the Church; among these were Grindal, Parkhurst, Sandys, Pilkington, and others."[i]

To those of the reformers mentioned by Neal as having accepted a bishopric, may be added JEWEL whom he has quoted so fully in a preceding extract (§538.)

541. From these observations and quotations of Neal, who was himself a Dissenter, it is evident that the difference that took place was grounded upon the habits and ceremonies of the Church, some refusing to accept bishoprics on account of these things and others accepting them notwithstanding, in hopes of being able to change them to their minds afterwards.

542. It also appears that what the Puritans contended for, was liberty *to stand or sit instead of kneeling at the sacrament, and to read prayers in a black gown instead of a surplice.* (§539.)

543. While the dispute was going on at Frankfort, some of the parties wrote to Calvin for his opinion on the subject. The following is an extract from his answer.

"Truly as in indifferent things, as external rites are, I am easy and flexible, so I do not think it is always expedient to humour the foolish moroseness of those who yield nothing of their custom. In the English Liturgy, such as you describe, I see there were many *tolerabiles ineptiæ*. By these two words I mean, that there was not that purity which was to be desired. Nevertheless what faults could not be corrected immediately, when no manifest impiety is joined with them, were to be borne for a time."

In this letter and the following which are to be found among his *Letters* in the same volume with his *Institutes*, (p. 98,) he endeavours to reconcile the parties, representing the matter about which they disputed as not of sufficient importance to cause them to separate; and although he finds fault with parts of that Liturgy, he was far from objecting to the use of a form of prayer in public service, as his letter to the Duke of Somerset proves.

---

h NEAL'S *History*, Vol. I. p. 178, 179. i *Ibid.* Vol. I. p. 180.

Digitized by Google

544. In this he says:

"As to a form of prayer and of ecclesiastical rites, I highly approve that it should be fixed, from which it may not be lawful for pastors to depart in their exercises; as well that provision may be made for the simplicity and unskilfulness of some, as that the agreement of all the Churches among themselves may thus more certainly appear. Finally also that the desultory levity of some who affect certain novelties, may be opposed: as I have before shown that the catechism itself tends to the same."[k]

545. It is even asserted on the authority of a letter of Calvin to Edward VI., King of England, that he offered to adopt the episcopal form of government in the Church of Geneva, as appears from the following extract.

"He, and Bullinger, and other learned men beyond sea, wrote in 1549 to Edward VI., offering to make him their defender, and to have Bishops in their Churches for better unity and concord amongst them, as appears from Strype's memorial of Archbishop Cranmer, as likewise from a writing of Archbishop Abbot's, found among the manuscripts of Archbishop Usher.' (Chandler's *Appeal defended*, p. 238.) Unfortunately the letter fell into the hands of the Popish Bishops Gardiner and Bonner, who in the names of the reformers, returned a surly answer to it. 'From that time,' says Strype, 'John Calvin and the Church of England were at variance in several points, which otherwise, through God's mercy, had been qualified, if those papers of his proposals had been discovered unto the Queen's majesty during John Calvin's life.'[l]

Neal in his *History of the Puritans* says of Strype, that he had "searched into the records of the English Reformation more than any man of the age."[m]

546. The English reformers having divided into two parties, those who thought it best to conform to the habits and ceremonies, and accept bishoprics, were involved by degrees in the disagreeable business of insisting that the others should conform. The latter, although it is admitted that if some had not complied for the time, in hopes of the removal of the grievances, the Church would have fallen back into Popery,[n] were determined in their opposition. Violent language was used on both sides: the one insisting that such trifles ought to be yielded to the Queen's command rather than endanger the Church, and treating the opposition as mere obstinacy; and the other urging that it was against their conscience to conform to the use of the ceremonies and habits. The contest became tyrannical on one side and intemperate on the other;[o] and at length the non-conformists began openly to contest the superiority of the episcopal office. "The breach," says Neal, "might easily have been made up at first,

k CALVIN'S *Epist.*

l BOWDEN'S *Letters*, Vol. II. p. 65. [Vol. I. p. 217, 2d *ed.*]

m *Preface to the History.* n NEAL, Vol. I. p. 194.

o A non-conformist minister preaching before the Queen said that she, while under persecution, was *tanquam ovis*, 'as it were a sheep;' but now it might be, *tanquam indomita juvenca*, 'as it were an untamed heifer.' NEAL'S *History*, Vol. I. p. 357.

Digitized by Google

but it widened by degrees; the passions of the contending parties increased, till the fire, which for some years was burning under ground, broke out into a civil war, and with unspeakable fury destroyed the constitution both of Church and State."[p]

547. We have thus seen that the Church was episcopal in the days of the Apostles, and continued so, without question, until the sixteenth century; that the reformers on the continent of Europe who laid aside the episcopal office admitted the main features of episcopacy in the primitive Church, and that the episcopate or a substitute for it was necessary in the Church, and that the office ought to be restored as soon as it could be; that the reformers in England retained episcopacy, but differed respecting habits and ceremonies so much as eventually to divide into two parties, the *Conformists* and the *Non-Conformists* or, as they are now called, *Churchmen* and *Dissenters;* the former retaining the episcopate, and the latter rejecting it. (§497 to 533: note to §518.)

548. It is to be remembered, moreover, that every Church upon earth, except those who rejected episcopal ordination in the sixteenth century, and those which have since sprung up as offsets from that stock, is episcopal. The Churches of all the rest of Europe, of Asia, and of Africa, are under that form of government to the present day. In the interior of Asia Dr. Buchanan discovered a few years ago a Church which traced its origin to the earliest ages of the Christian religion, without communication with Europeans, until the Portuguese, on doubling the Cape of Good Hope and arriving on the coast of Malabar in 1503, found to their astonishment a Christian Church where they had expected to find Heathens. This Church also was episcopal, having Bishops, Priests or Presbyters, and Deacons.

549. There are two things on which it will not be improper to make a few observations before closing this Essay. The one is the preservation of the regular succession of Bishops from the commencement down to the present time. Let us consider how many things stand in the way of a failure in the succession of Bishops. First: If the episcopate is a divine institution, God is pledged to continue it, not only by the propriety of it—the necessity of it, but by his promise to those whom he first commissioned, *Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world:* and therefore it has not failed. Secondly: If it was instituted by men, for the sake of distinction, as the right to the distinction and advantages attached to it, rested upon the validity of the title to the office, the Bishops chosen would be very particular in having every thing relating to their election and ordination perfectly regular. And we find that it was the common practice, when a Bishop was ordained, for him to send Presbyters to the other Churches, even from Italy to Carthage,

p NEAL'S *History*, Vol. I. p. 253.

Digitized by Google

to Alexandria, to Antioch, &c. to show the validity of his claim to the office, how he was chosen, and by whom ordained; so that if another claimed the office, the Bishops might be able to decide for themselves who was truly and regularly chosen and ordained. Inasmuch therefore as religious motives as well as interest would lead the Bishops to be very particular in receiving full authority, and in being regularly introduced into the office, we have every reason to believe that every man took good care for himself in that respect. We have moreover certain evidence that this matter had attracted the attention of the Church at a very early day; for the Council of Nice, in 326, made the regulation that three Bishops must officiate in the ordination of a Bishop; and other councils decided questions on this subject in the fourth century. Under these circumstances, what Church would allow the ceremony of ordination of a newly chosen Bishop to be omitted? What Bishop would fail to secure to himself, by a regular and perfect ordination, advantages and distinction which were too eagerly sought after? Who can point to the man who, on entering the ministry, failed to seek ordination at the hands of those whom he thought qualified to ordain? What Presbyterian, entering the ministry in that Church, would receive ordination at the hands of their ruling elders or of their deacons? What Bishop in the Episcopal Church would receive ordination to the episcopate from a company of Presbyters? The very idea is absurd. The only possibility of a breach in the episcopal succession could arise from the Bishops at some period of the Church laying aside the ceremony of ordination, or allowing other than Bishops to ordain Bishops. The first idea is an absurdity too great to be advocated by any man in his senses: and as to the other, when no instance can be produced by the ablest and most learned advocates for presbyterian ordination, in which Presbyters laid on hands by permission of the Church until the year 657;[q] when it is expressly stated in that permission that it was when the Bishop was present, officiating, that the Presbyter was allowed to lay his hands near the hands of the Bishop; and that this was confined to the ordination of a Presbyter: who will be so hardy as to assert, who so credulous as to believe, that *in the ordination of Bishops*, Bishops ceased to officiate and Presbyters had been permitted to officiate *alone* until the Church had lost episcopal ordination? In what age after 657 [398] did this occur? Were the lordly Bishops of those times satisfied to yield this part of their official duties to the inferior clergy? So far from it that the privilege of ordaining to the episcopate was more and more restricted, and the Metropolitan Bishops claimed the right of ordaining all Bishops. Moreover let it be considered that inasmuch as a number of Bishops, sometimes sixteen, officiated in the ordination of one, if by some inconceivable act of folly

q [Until the year 398.]

Digitized by Google

on the part of a person elected Bishop of a Church or on the part of the Church itself, he were not regularly ordained, his incapacity would not affect the newly ordained, inasmuch as there were so many more joined with him in the ceremony. So far is the custom of the Church, then, from favouring a vitiated state of the episcopacy, that its continual tendency would be, admitting the possibility of a vitiated state, to correct it.

550. The second thing proposed to be noticed is the doubt alleged to rest on the validity of the succession in that part of the Catholic Church commonly denominated the Protestant Episcopal Church. It has been doubted whether the ordination of Archbishop Parker, through whom all the Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church of England derive their ordination, was perfectly canonical; because the persons who ordained him had been deprived of their bishoprics, and expelled the country, by the Popish party on the accession of Mary to the Crown of England. The question to be settled in this case is, whether a Bishop who is expelled from his Bishopric by a successful party, in the contests about doctrines which have in all ages agitated the Church, is thereby deprived of his *character* of Bishop. The two following cases will show that he is not. The one occurred in the sixteenth century, and the other in the early ages of the Church.

551. The first case was that of Richard Pates, Bishop of Worcester in England, who fled to the continent on the death of Mary and the re-establishment of the party who advocated the reformation. He attended the Council of Trent, and signed the decrees or acts of the Council as Bishop of Worcester.[r] In this case the Pope's party assented to the principle, that the expelled Bishop retains his character.

552. The other case occurred in the fourth century. The Queen of the Saracens being at war with the Romans made peace, and desired that Moses, a Saracen by birth, celebrated for his religion, should be ordained Bishop for her instruction. He was accordingly taken to Alexandria; but when he was presented to Lucius the Bishop, an Arian, he refused to receive ordination at his hands, on account of the cruelty with which he had treated the orthodox, and desired to be ordained by *the exiles* whom Lucius had driven from their bishoprics. He and his friends accordingly went to the exiles, and they ordained him.[s]

553. These two cases show in the plainest manner that the Papists, as well as the Church in former times, admitted the continuance of the episcopal character in Bishops exiled through the violence of party contentions. Many cases of similar import might no doubt be easily collected from the histories of the contests between the Arians and the Orthodox. The Bishops

r FULLER'S *Church History*, Book IX. p. 58.
s SOCRATES *Eccles. Hist.* Book IV. Chap. xxxvi.

Digitized by Google

therefore who ordained Matthew Parker, *viz.* Barlow, Scory, Coverdale, and Hodgkins, although they had been driven into exile in the reign of Mary, when they returned on the accession of Elizabeth were fully authorized to ordain him.[t]

SUMMARY.

554. To sum up the whole matter, it is apparent from the earliest writings of the Christians that there were three orders of ministers in the Church; Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons. This is evident from the Epistles and other works of IGNATIUS, CLEMENT, and POLYCARP, who were conversant with the Apostles; of IRENÆUS, TERTULLIAN, and CLEMENS ALEXANDRINUS, in the second century; of CYPRIAN, FIRMILIAN, CORNELIUS, DIONYSIUS, in the third; of EUSEBIUS, JEROME, SOZOMEN, SOCRATES, and THEODORET in the fourth; and of many more. It is not contradicted by a solitary passage in any early writer. It is assented to by very many of the most learned writers of the Presbyterian Churches, *viz.* by BLONDEL, SALMASIUS, LE CLERC; and asserted by GROTIUS and CALVIN, in a remarkably plain and distinct manner.[u]

555. It is evident that of these the Bishop was chief; that there was but one Bishop in a Church, although the Presbyters were numerous in proportion to the number of the members; and that he governed the Presbyters and the whole Church; nothing being done without his permission. This is asserted by Ignatius, assented to by Polycarp, asserted by Irenæus, Tertullian, Cyprian, Eusebius, and Jerome, besides others; and contradicted by no one. It is admitted by writers in favour of presbyterian church government; as by King and Grotius; and even Calvin states that there was but one Bishop to a city and the neighbouring region of country, (§531) that he possessed such power among the Presbyters as a Consul has in a Senate, and the whole tenor of the fourth chapter of the fourth Book of his *Institutes*, shows that the office was for life.[v]

556. There was an ordination appropriated to each order, and when a Presbyter was chosen Bishop he was ordained to the

---

t Before proceeding to the summary of the preceding pages I must notice an unimportant error in the meaning of a word in Section 453. I find that Grotius uses the word *clerus* in such a manner as to indicate that *the clergy* are meant by it, and not an individual. Therefore *the clergy*, by permission of the Bishop, gave absolution to offenders and lapsed persons, in cases of extremity when the person was about to die and the Bishop was not at hand. This, however, was not Confirmation, as is fully proved in Sections 452 and 453.

u See Appendix: also §127, 151, 153, 154, 162, 165, 172, 180 and 183, 188, 189, 191, 192, 194, 195, 201, 202, 203, 241, 242, 247, 252, 257, 266, 282, 302, 329 and 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 336, 337, 341 to 349, 352, 353, 359 &c. 378, 397, 497 to 533.

v See Appendix, italic lines: also §127, 130, 153, 154, 180, and 183; 194, 198 to 203; 207, 241, 247 &c. 252, 257, 266, 275, 282, 329 to 334; 336, 337, 341 to 349; 352, 357, 378, 397, 425, 503 to 510; 513, 514, 528, 531.

Digitized by Google

office. This is asserted or plainly indicated by Cyprian, Cornelius, Jerome, and Eusebius; and by Grotius and Calvin.[w]

557. The Bishops alone ordained. There is not a passage showing that Presbyters took any part until the latter part of the fourth century, when they were permitted to lay their hands near the hands of the Bishop when he ordained a Presbyter. On the contrary, in every one of the few instances in which they attempted to ordain, the ceremony was declared null and void. This is asserted or plainly indicated by Cyprian, Cornelius, Jerome, Eusebius, in the decisions of some councils, and by Grotius. Even Calvin asserts that Bishops ordained Bishops; and that every Bishop, with his Presbyters, ordained his own Presbyters; although without a solitary passage to support him in his declaration, that Presbyters assisted the Bishop in the ordination of Presbyters, before the permission granted them at the period above mentioned.[x]

558. The Bishops were appointed by the Apostles their successors, to govern the Churches; and the name *Bishop*, which at first was a title of the Presbyters, was restricted in the time of the Apostles, and consequently by them, to that order which they set over the Churches, (one over each Church) to rule them in their place. This is asserted by Irenæus, Tertullian, Firmilian, Jerome, Hilary; and assented to by the most learned Presbyterian writers, Peter Moulin, Le Clerc, Grotius; even Calvin allows that they were appointed from the time of Mark, which was several years before the martyrdom of Peter and Paul, and many years before the death of John. (§513 note.)[y]

559. In particular, the ancient writers declare that the Apostles appointed James Bishop of Jerusalem after the ascension of our SAVIOUR, and Mark Bishop of Alexandria; that Paul appointed Timothy Bishop of Ephesus, and Titus Bishop of Crete; that Peter and Paul appointed Linus Bishop of Rome; that John appointed Ignatius Bishop of Antioch, and Polycarp Bishop of Smyrna. For these appointments we have the direct assertion of Irenæus, Tertullian, Clemens Alexandrinus, Jerome, Hilary, Chrysostom, Primasius, Theodoret; and the full assent of the learned Presbyterian Grotius.[z]

These declarations are very strongly confirmed by a comparison of the powers of the Bishops as stated by the earliest writers, who were contemporary with Paul and the rest of the Apostles, with the powers shown by Paul's Epistles to Timothy to belong to the latter when he took charge of the Church at Ephesus. Thus according to Ignatius, who was contemporary with Paul and Timothy—having seen the SAVIOUR in the flesh, (§356,

---

w See §252, 258 &c. 263, 302, 331, 333, 336, 346 to 349; 359 to 366; 504, 532.

x See §191, 252, 302, 333, 335, 336, 359 to 366; 467 to 470; 504, 517 and notes; 532.

y See §130, 185, 187, 206, 243, 244, 247 to 250; 282, 288, 290 and 291; 498, 500, 501, 504, 509 to 513; 516, 530.

z See §130, 243, 291, 300, 326, 380 note; 501, 504, 511, 512.

Digitized by Google

512) and died but a few years after John, (§356, 357)—the Bishop ruled the Presbyters and the whole Church.[a] And according to Paul, Timothy had the power of appointing and ordaining such as he esteemed suitable persons;[b] of honouring them if they acted well;[c] of publicly rebuking them for offences committed;[d] of restraining[e] them from preaching false doctrine,[f] and enforcing the teaching of the true doctrines.[g] So that Timothy unquestionably exercised episcopal power and authority in the Church at Ephesus, and was succeeded by Onesimus, in the lifetime of Ignatius, who in his *Epistle to the Ephesians*, mentions with great approbation Onesimus their Bishop, who had visited him on his way to Rome to suffer martyrdom.

560. Such is the abounding evidence on this most interesting question; and although but a selection from a profusion of the same kind in the voluminous writings of the early fathers, it shows that the doctrine, *that the Church of* CHRIST *was, with his full approbation* (§512,) *left by his immediate agents under episcopal government*, stands upon the same immoveable basis of truth that supports every other part of the Christian revelation. So believing, after six months of close investigation of many writers of the first, second, third, and fourth centuries, and of the arguments brought forward by the Presbyterian writers to justify their departure in the sixteenth century from the established order of the Church, as well as those given by Mr. Wesley for his in the eighteenth, the writer could not for the reasons already given (§369) and others connected with them, do otherwise than candidly avow his convictions and attach himself to the Church.

This Essay was originally intended chiefly for the satisfaction of his friends; to obviate misrepresentations and show the grounds on which he had made an important change in his relation to many of them. To this he was led by the conviction that they would not conceive of the true grounds unless stated to them; inasmuch as the question here discussed, by the culpable neglect of most of those who are aware of the true state of the case, is allowed to sleep as if it were a matter of little importance. He is entirely persuaded that those whose good opinion he is most solicitous to retain, will at least give him

a See Ignatius' *Epistle* (in the Appendix) *to the Ephesians*, Sections 4, 5, 6; *to the Magnesians*, Sections 3 and 4; *to the Tralliane*, Section 12; *to the Philadelphians*, Sections 3, 4, and 7; *to the Smyrneans*, Sections 8 and 9; and *to Polycarp*, Section 4.

b 1 Tim. iii. 10; v. 22; 2 Tim. ii. 2.

c 1 Tim. v. 17.

d 1 Tim. v. 19, 20, 21.

e The word translated *charge* in the third verse of the first chapter of the first Epistle to Timothy, is very strong and conveys the idea of authority to enforce the charge: and it would be ridiculous in a man to *charge* those under him not to do a thing, unless he had authority to enforce the injunction. But the original word παραγγέλῃς, conveys the idea of *restraining*, in the strongest manner: *command, denounce, forbid, interdict*, are words given in the *Lexicon* of HEDERICUS, as the meaning of this Greek word.

f 1 Tim. i. 3; vi. 3, 4, 5.

g 1 Tim. iv. 11, 12; 2 Tim. i. 13; ii. 2.

Digitized by Google

credit for honest conviction, after reading the preceding statement of the question; and therefore it became a duty to himself and to them to make it, that the friendship which has stood the test of time and difficulties, may not be sacrificed without an effort to preserve it. He is even persuaded that some of them will think the mass of evidence contained in these pages sufficient to establish the doctrine, that the Church of CHRIST was under episcopal government from the commencement.

But although this Essay was originally intended chiefly for the friends of the writer, several considerations not necessary to state, produced the determination not to confine its circulation to them.

This Essay has extended to a much greater length than was expected. After progressing in the work it was found not an easy matter to compress the abundance of evidence into the compass of a few pages. The circumstance of meeting with several works having an important bearing on the question, at different periods, as noted in one or two instances in the course of the Essay, added somewhat to the length of it. As the same arguments are advanced by different writers, they have been noticed sometimes more than once, and have caused, unavoidably in these circumstances, something of repetition. It was however thought better to notice these works, such as King's, notwithstanding this inconvenience. The translations have been made with care, and, it is believed, faithfully. Some of the more important passages are given in the original, by means of which, not only may the faithfulness of the translation in those cases be ascertained, but a judgment may be formed of those in which, the original is not given. To give the whole would have swelled the Essay to too great a length.

The discussion of this subject is limited in these pages to the single question, Whether the government of the Church was episcopal or not in the commencement? Other points intimately connected with it, relating to the order of the Church, and to the evil consequences of separation from it, are ably illustrated in the *Sermons of the* Rev. DR. CHAPMAN, of Lexington, not long since published.

Digitized by Google

APPENDIX I.

CONTAINING THE MARTYRDOM AND THE EPISTLES OF ST. IGNATIUS, TAKEN FROM THE EDITION PUBLISHED BY WILLIAM WAKE, ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.

MARTYRDOM OF ST. IGNATIUS.

Translated from the original Greek, and published by Dr. Grabe, in his Spicilegium Patrum, Tom. 2.

1. When Trajan not long since came to the Roman empire, Ignatius, the disciple of St. John the Apostle [and Evangelist,] a man in all things like unto the Apostles, governed the Church of Antioch with all care. Who being scarcely able to escape the storms of the many persecutions before under Domitian, as a good governor, by the helm of prayer and fasting, by the constancy of his doctrine and spiritual labour, withstood the raging floods; fearing lest they should sink those who either wanted courage, or were not well grounded in the faith.

2. Wherefore the persecution being at present somewhat abated, he rejoiced greatly at the tranquillity of his Church: yet was troubled as to himself, that he had not attained to a true love of Christ, nor was come up to the pitch of a perfect disciple. For he thought that the confession which is made by martyrdom, would bring him to a yet more close and intimate union with the Lord. Wherefore continuing a few years longer with the Church, and after the manner of a divine lamp, illuminating the hearts *of the faithful* by the exposition of holy Scriptures, he attained to what he had desired.

3. For Trajan, in the nineteenth year of his empire, being lifted up with his victory over the Scythians and Dacians, and many other nations; and thinking that the religious company of Christians was yet wanting to his absolute and universal dominion; and thereupon threatening them that they should be persecuted, unless they would choose to worship the devil, with all other nations; fear obliged all such as lived religiously, either to sacrifice or to die. Wherefore our brave soldier of Christ, being in fear for the Church of Antioch, was voluntarily brought before Trajan; who was at that time there on his way to Armenia, and the Parthians, against whom he was hastening.

4. Being come into the presence of the emperor Trajan; the emperor asked him, saying: "What a wicked wretch art thou, thus to endeavour to transgress our commands, and to persuade others also to do likewise to their destruction?" Ignatius answered, "No one ought to call Theophorus after such a manner; forasmuch as all wicked spirits are departed far from the servants of God.—But if because I am a trouble to those evil spirits, you call me wicked; with reference to them, I confess the charge, for having within me Christ the heavenly King, I dissolve all the snares of the devils."

5. Trajan replied, "And who is Theophorus?" *Ignatius.* "He who has Christ in his breast." *Trajan.* "And do not we then seem to thee to have the gods within us, who fight for us against our enemies?" *Ignatius.* "You err, in that you call the evil spirits of the heathens, gods. For there is but one God, who made heaven and earth, and the sea, and all that are in

Digitized by Google

them; and *one* JESUS CHRIST his only begotten Son; whose kingdom may I enjoy."

6. *Trajan.* "His kingdom, you say, who was crucified under Pontius Pilate?" *Ignatius.* "His who crucified my sin, with the inventor of it; and has put all the deceit and malice of the devil under the feet of those who carry him in their heart." *Trajan.* "Dost thou then carry him who was crucified within thee?" *Ignatius.* "I do; for it is written, I will dwell in them and walk in them."[a] Then Trajan pronounced this sentence against him: Forasmuch as Ignatius has confessed that he carries about within himself him that was crucified, we command that he be carried bound by soldiers to the great Rome, there to be thrown to the beasts, for the entertainment of the people.

7. When the holy martyr heard this sentence, he cried out with joy, "I thank thee, O LORD, that thou hast vouchsafed to honour me with a perfect love towards thee; and hast made me to be put into iron bonds with thy apostle Paul." Having said this, he with joy put his bonds about him; and having first prayed for the Church, and commended it with tears unto the LORD, he was hurried away, like a choice ram, the leader of a good flock, by the brutish soldiers, in order to his being carried to Rome, there to be devoured by the blood-thirsty beasts.

8. Wherefore with much readiness and joy, out of his desire to suffer, he left Antioch, and came to Seleucia; from whence he was to sail. And after a great deal of toil, being come to Smyrna, he left the ship with great gladness, and hastened to see the holy Polycarp, his fellow-scholar, who was Bishop there; for they had both of them been formerly the disciples of St. John.

9. Being brought to him, and communicating to him some spiritual gifts, and glorying in his bonds; he intreated first of all the whole Church (for the Churches and cities of Asia attended this holy man by their Bishops and Priests and Deacons, all hastening to him, if by any means they might receive some part of his spiritual gift) but more particularly Polycarp, to contend with GOD in his behalf; that being suddenly taken by the beasts from the world, he might appear before the face of CHRIST. And this he thus spake and testified, extending so much his love for CHRIST, as one who was about to receive heaven through his own good confession, and the earnest contention of those who prayed together with him: and to return a recompense to the Churches, who came to meet him by their governors, he sent letters of thanks to them, which distilled spiritual grace, with prayer and exhortation. Seeing, therefore, all men so kindly affected towards him; and fearing lest the love of the brotherhood should prevent his hastening to the LORD, now that a fair door of suffering was opened to him; he wrote the Epistle we here subjoin, to the Romans.[b]

10. And having thus strengthened such of the brethren at Rome as were against his martyrdom, by this Epistle, as he desired; setting sail from Smyrna, (for he was pressed by the soldiers to hasten to the public spectacles at great Rome, that being delivered to the wild beasts in sight of the people of the Romans, he might receive the crown for which he strove,) he came to Troas: from whence going on, being brought to Neopolis, he passed by Philippi through Macedonia, and that part of Epirus which is next to Epidamnus: having found a ship in one of the sea-ports, he sailed over the Adriatic Sea: [and from thence entering into the Tyrrhene] and passing by several islands and cities, at length he saw Puteoli. Which being shown to the holy man, he hastened to go forth, being desirous to walk from thence, in the way that Paul and the Apostles had gone.[c] But a violent wind arising, and driving on the ship, would not suffer him so to do: wherefore commending the love of the brethren in that place, he sailed forward.

---

a 2 Cor. vi. 16. b See the Epistle. c Acts xxviii. 13, 14.

Digitized by Google

11. And the wind continuing favourable to us, in one day and a night, we indeed were unwillingly hurried on, as sorrowing to think of being separated from this holy martyr: but to him it happened justly according to his wish, that he might go the sooner out of the world, and attain unto the LORD whom he loved. Wherefore sailing into the Roman port, and those impure sports being almost at an end, the soldiers began to be offended at our slowness; but the Bishop with great joy complied with their hastiness.

12. Being, therefore, soon forced away from the port so called, we forthwith met the brethren; (for the report of what concerned the holy martyr was spread abroad;) who were full of fear and joy; for they rejoiced in that GOD had vouchsafed them the company of Theophorus; but were afraid, when they considered, that such a one was brought thither to die. Now some of these he commanded to hold their peace, who were the most zealous for his safety, and said, that *they would appease the people, that they should not desire the destruction of the just.* Who presently knowing this by the SPIRIT, and saluting all of them, he desired them that they would show a true love to him; disputing yet more with them than he had done in his Epistle, and persuaded them not to envy him who was hastening unto the LORD. And so, all the brethren kneeling down, he prayed to the SON OF GOD in behalf of the Churches, that he would put a stop to the persecution, and *continue* the love of the brethren towards each other: which being done, he was with all haste led into the amphitheatre, and speedily, according to the command of Cæsar before given, thrown in, the end of the spectacles being at hand. For it was then a very solemn day, called in the Roman tongue the 13th of the Calends of January, upon which the people were ordinarily wont to be gathered together.—Thus was he delivered to the cruel beasts, near the temple, by wicked men: that so the desire of the holy martyr Ignatius might be accomplished; as it is written, "the desire of the righteous is acceptable;"[d] namely, that he might not be burthensome to any of the brethren, by the gathering of his relics, but might be wholly devoured by them; according as in his Epistle he had before wished, that so his end might be. For only the greater and harder of his holy bones remained: which were carried to Antioch, and there put up in a napkin, as an inestimable treasure left to the Church by the grace which was in the martyr.

13. Now these things were done the 13th of the Calends of January, that is the 20th day of December; Sura and Synecius being the second time Consuls of the Romans; of which we ourselves were eye-witnesses: and being the night following watching with tears in the house, praying to GOD with our bended knees, that he would give us weak men some assurance of what had been before done; it happened, that falling into a slumber, some of us on the sudden saw the blessed Ignatius standing by us and embracing us: others beheld the blessed martyr praying for us: others as it were dropping with sweat, as if he were just come from his great labour, and standing by the LORD.

14. Which when we saw, being filled with joy; and comparing the visions of our dreams with one another, we glorified GOD, the giver of all good things; and being assured of the blessedness of the saint, we have made known unto you both the day and time: that being assembled together according to the time of his martyrdom, we may communicate with the combatant, and most valiant martyr of CHRIST; who trod under foot the devil, and perfected the course he had piously desired, in CHRIST JESUS our LORD; by whom, and with whom, all glory and power be to the FATHER, with the blessed SPIRIT, for ever and ever. Amen.

---

d Prov. x. 24.

Digitized by Google

EPISTLE OF ST. IGNATIUS

TO THE EPHESIANS.

Ignatius, who is also called Theophorus, to the Church which is at Ephesus in Asia, most deservedly happy; being blessed through the greatness and fulness of God the Father, and predestinated before the world began, that it should always be unto an enduring and unchangeable glory; being united and chosen through his true passion, according to the will of the Father, and Jesus Christ our God; all happiness, by Jesus Christ, and his undefiled grace.

1. I have heard of your name, much beloved in God, which ye have very justly attained by a habit of righteousness, according to the faith and love which is in Jesus Christ our Saviour: how that being followers of God, and stirring up yourselves by the blood of Christ, ye have perfectly accomplished the work that was connatural unto you. For hearing that I came bound from Syria, for the common name and hope, [*viz.* of Christ,] trusting through your prayers to fight with beasts at Rome: that so by suffering I may become indeed the disciple of him who gave himself to God, an offering and sacrifice for us, [ye hastened to see me.] *I received, therefore, in the name of God, your whole multitude in Onesimus; who by inexpressible love is ours, but according to the flesh is your Bishop: whom I beseech you by Jesus Christ to love; and that you would all strive to be like unto him. And blessed be God, who has granted unto you, who are so worthy of him, to enjoy such an excellent Bishop.*

2. For what concerns my fellow servant Burrhus, and your most blessed Deacon in things pertaining to God; *I intreat you that he may tarry longer, both for your's, and your Bishop's honour.* And Crocus also, worthy both our God and you, whom I have received as the pattern of your love, has in all things refreshed me, as the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ shall also refresh him; together with Onesimus, and Burrhus, and Euplus, and Fronto, in whom I have, as to your charity, seen all of you. And may I always have joy of you, if I shall be worthy of it. It is therefore fitting that you should by all means glorify Jesus Christ, who hath glorified you: that by a uniform obedience ye may be perfectly joined together in the same mind, and in the same judgment; and may also speak the same things concerning every thing; *and that being subject to your Bishop, and the Presbytery, ye may be wholly and thoroughly sanctified.*

3. These things I prescribe to you, not as if I were somebody extraordinary: for though I am bound for his name, I am not yet perfect in Christ Jesus. But now I begin to learn, and I speak to you as fellow-disciples together with me. For I ought to have been stirred up by you, in faith, in admonition, in patience, in long-suffering: but forasmuch as charity suffers me not to be silent towards you, I have first taken upon me to exhort you, that ye would all run together according to the will of God. For even Jesus Christ, our insuperable life, is sent by the will of the Father; as the Bishops, appointed unto the utmost bounds of the earth, are by the will of Jesus Christ.

4. *Wherefore it will become you to run together according to the will of your Bishop, as also ye do. For your famous Presbytery, worthy of God, is fitted as exactly to the Bishop, as the strings are to the harp.* Therefore in your concord, and agreeing charity, Jesus Christ is sung; and every single person among you makes up the chorus: that so being all consonant

Digitized by Google

in love, and taking up the song of God, ye may in a perfect unity, with one voice, sing to the Father by Jesus Christ; to the end that he may both hear you, and perceive by your works, that ye are indeed the members of his Son: wherefore it is profitable for you to live in an unblameable unity, that so ye may always have a fellowship with God.

5. For if I in this little time have had such a familiarity with your Bishop, I mean not a carnal, but spiritual acquaintance with him; how much more must I think you happy who are so joined to him, as the Church is to Jesus Christ, and Jesus Christ to the Father; that so all things may agree in the same unity? Let no man deceive himself; if a man be not within the altar, he is deprived of the bread of God. For if the prayer of one or two be of such force, as we are told,[e] how much more powerful shall that of the Bishop and the whole Church be? He therefore that does not come together into the same place with it, is proud, and has already condemned himself. *For it is written*, "God *resisteth the proud.*"[f] *Let us take heed therefore, that we do not set ourselves against the Bishop, that we may be subject to* God.

6. The more any one sees his Bishop silent, the more let him revere him. For whomsoever the master of the house sends to be over his own household, we ought in like manner to receive him, as we would do him that sent him. *It is therefore evident that we ought to look upon the Bishop, even as we would do upon the* Lord *himself.* And indeed Onesimus himself does greatly commend your good order in God: that you all live according to the truth, and that no heresy dwells among you. For neither do ye hearken to any one more than to Jesus Christ, speaking to you in truth.

7. For some there are who carry about the name of Christ in deceitfulness, but do things unworthy of God; whom ye must flee as ye would do so many wild beasts. For they are ravening dogs, who bite secretly: against whom ye must guard yourselves, as men hardly to be cured. There is one physician, both fleshly and spiritual; made and not made; God incarnate; true life in death; both of Mary and of God: first passable, then impassable; even Jesus Christ our Lord.

8. Wherefore let no man deceive you; as indeed neither are ye deceived, being wholly the servants of God. For inasmuch as there is no contention, nor strife among you, to trouble you, ye must needs live according to God's will. My soul be for yours; and I myself the expiatory offering for your Church of Ephesus, so famous throughout the world. They that are of the flesh cannot do the works of the Spirit; neither they that are of the Spirit the works of the flesh. As he that has faith, cannot be an infidel; nor he that is an infidel have faith. But even those things which ye do according to the flesh are spiritual; forasmuch as ye do all things in Jesus Christ.

9. Nevertheless, I have heard of some who have passed by you, having perverse doctrine: whom ye did not suffer to sow among you; but stopped your ears, that ye might not receive those things that were sown by them: as being the stones of the temple of the Father, prepared for his building; and drawn upon high by the cross of Christ, as by an engine: using the Holy Ghost as the rope; your faith being your support; and your charity the way that leads unto God. Ye are therefore, with all your companions in the same journey, full of God; his spiritual temples full of Christ, full of holiness; adorned in all things with the commands of Christ: in whom also I rejoice that I have been thought worthy by this present Epistle to converse with you; that with respect to the other life, ye love nothing but God only.

10. Pray also without ceasing for other men: for there is hope of repent-

---

e Matt. xviii. 19. f James iv. 6.

Digitized by Google

ance in them, that they may attain unto God. Let them therefore at least be instructed by your works, if they will be no other way. Be ye mild at their anger; humble at their boasting: to their blasphemies, return your prayers: to their error, your firmness in the faith: when they are cruel, be ye gentle; not endeavouring to imitate their ways: (let us be their brethren in all kindness and moderation, but let us be followers of the Lord; for who was ever more unjustly used? more destitute? more despised?) that so no herb of the devil may be found in you; but ye may remain in all holiness and sobriety both of body and spirit, in Christ Jesus.

11. The last times are come upon us: let us therefore be very reverent, and fear the long suffering of God, that it be not to us unto condemnation. For let us either fear the wrath that is to come, or let us love the grace that we at present enjoy; that by the one or other of these, we may be found in Christ Jesus, unto true life. Besides him, let nothing be worthy of you; for whom also I bear about these bonds, those spiritual jewels, in which I would to God that I might arise through your prayers: of which I intreat you to make me always partaker, that I may be found in the lot of the Christians of Ephesus, who have always agreed with the Apostles, through the power of Jesus Christ.

12. I know both who I am, and to whom I write: I, a person condemned; ye, such as have obtained mercy: I, exposed to danger: ye, confirmed against danger. Ye are the passage of those that are killed for God; the companions of Paul in the mysteries of the Gospel; the holy, the martyr, the deservedly most happy Paul: at whose feet may I be found, when I shall have attained unto God; who throughout all his Epistle makes mention of you in Christ Jesus.

13. Let it be your care therefore to come more fully together, to the praise and glory of God. For when ye meet fully together in the same place, the powers of the devil are destroyed, and his mischief is dissolved by the unity of your faith. And indeed, nothing is better than peace; by which all war, both spiritual and earthly, is abolished.

14. Of all which nothing is hid from you, if ye have perfect faith and charity in Christ Jesus, which are the beginning and end of life. For the beginning is faith; the end charity. And these two joined together, are of God: but all other things which concern a holy life are the consequences of these. No man professing a true faith, sinneth; neither does he who has charity, hate any. *The tree is made manifest by its fruit.*[g] So they who profess themselves to be Christians, are known by what they do. For Christianity is not the work of an outward profession; but shows itself in the power of faith, if a man be found faithful unto the end.

15. It is better for a man to hold his peace, and be; than to say, 'he is a Christian,' and not to be. It is good to teach; if what he says, he does likewise. There is therefore one master who spake, and it was done; and even those things which he did without speaking are worthy of the Father. He that possesses the word of Jesus, is truly able to hear his very silence, that he may be perfect; and both do according to what he speaks, and be known by those things of which he is silent. There is nothing hid from God, but even our secrets are nigh unto him. Let us therefore do all things, as becomes those who have God dwelling in them; that we may be his temples, and he may be our God: as also he is, and will manifest himself before our faces, by those things *for which* we justly love him.

16. Be not deceived, my brethren: those that corrupt families by adultery, shall not inherit the kingdom of God. If therefore they who do this according to the flesh, have suffered death; how much more shall he die, who

g Matt. xii. 33.

Digitized by Google

by his wicked doctrine corrupts the faith of God, for which CHRIST was crucified? he that is thus defiled, shall depart into unquenchable fire, and so also shall he that hearkens to him.

17. For this cause did the LORD suffer the ointment to be poured on his head, that he might breathe the breath of immortality unto his Church. Be not ye therefore anointed with the evil savour of the doctrine of the prince of this world: let him not take you captive from the life that is set before you. And why are we not all wise; seeing we have received the knowledge of GOD, which is JESUS CHRIST? Why do we suffer ourselves foolishly to perish; not considering the gift which the LORD has truly sent to us?

18. Let my life be sacrificed for the doctrine of the cross; which is indeed a scandal to the unbelievers, but to us is salvation and life eternal. "Where is the wise man? where is the disputer?"[h] where is the boasting of those who are called wise? for our GOD JESUS CHRIST, was according to the dispensation of GOD, conceived in the womb of Mary, of the seed of David, by the HOLY GHOST: he was born, and baptized, that through his passion, he might purify water, to the washing away of sin.

19. Now the virginity of Mary, and he who was born of her, was kept in secret from the prince of this world; as was also the death of our LORD; three of the mysteries the most spoken of throughout the world, yet done in secret by GOD. How then was our SAVIOUR manifested to the world? a star shone in heaven beyond all the other stars, and its light was inexpressible, and its novelty struck terror into men's minds. All the rest of the stars, together with the sun and moon, were the chorus to this star: but that sent out its light exceedingly above them all. And men began to be troubled to think whence this new star came, so unlike to all the others. Hence all the power of magic became dissolved; and every bond of wickedness was destroyed; men's ignorance was taken away, and the old kingdom abolished; GOD himself appearing in the form of a man, for the renewal of eternal life. From thence began what GOD had prepared: from thenceforth things were disturbed; forasmuch as he designed to abolish death.

20. But if JESUS CHRIST shall give me grace through your prayers, and it be his will, I purpose in a second epistle, which I will suddenly write unto you, to manifest to you more fully the dispensation of which I have now begun to speak, unto the new man, which is JESUS CHRIST; both in his faith and charity; in his suffering, and in his resurrection: especially if the LORD shall make known unto me, that ye all by name come together in common in one faith, and in one JESUS CHRIST; who was of the race of David according to the flesh; the son of man, and Son of GOD, *obeying your Bishop and the Presbytery with an entire affection;* breaking one and the same bread, which is the medicine of immortality; our antidote that we should not die, but live forever in CHRIST JESUS.

21. My soul be for yours, and theirs whom ye have sent, to the glory of GOD; even unto Smyrna, from whence also I write to you; giving thanks unto the LORD, and loving Polycarp as even I do you. Remember me, as JESUS CHRIST does remember you. Pray for the Church which is in Syria, from whence I am carried bound to Rome; being the least of all the faithful which are there, as I have been thought worthy to be found to the glory of GOD. Fare ye well in GOD THE FATHER, and in JESUS CHRIST, our common hope. Amen.

To the Ephesians.

---

h 1 Cor. i. 20.

Digitized by Google

EPISTLE OF ST. IGNATIUS

TO THE MAGNESIANS.

Ignatius who is also called Theophorus; to the blessed [Church,] by the grace of God the Father in Jesus Christ our Saviour; in whom I salute the Church which is at Magnesia near the Meander, and wish it all joy, in God the Father, and in Jesus Christ.

1. When I heard of your well ordered love and charity in God, being full of joy, I desired much to speak unto you in the faith of Jesus Christ. For having been thought worthy to obtain a most excellent name, in the bonds which I carry about, I salute the Churches; wishing in them a union both of the body and Spirit of Jesus Christ, our eternal life; as also of faith and charity, to which nothing is preferred: but especially of Jesus and the Father; in whom if we undergo all the injuries of the prince of this present world, and escape, we shall enjoy God.

2. Seeing then I have been judged worthy to see you, by Damas your most excellent Bishop: and by your very worthy Presbyters, Bassus, and Apollonius; and by my fellow servant Sotio the Deacon; *in whom I rejoice, forasmuch as he is subject unto his Bishop as to the grace of* God, *and to the Presbyters as to the law of* Jesus Christ; *I determined to write unto you.*

3. *Wherefore it will become you also not to use your Bishop too familiarly upon the account of his youth; but to yield all reverence to him according to the power of* God *the Father:* as also I perceive that your holy presbyters do; *not considering his age, which indeed to appearance is young; but as becomes those who are prudent in* God, *submitting to him, or rather not to him, but to the* Father *of our* Lord Jesus Christ *the Bishop of us all. It will therefore behove you, with all sincerity, to obey your Bishop; in honour of him whose pleasure it is that ye should do so, because he that does not do so, deceives not the Bishop whom he sees, but affronts him that is invisible. For whatsoever of this kind is done, it reflects not upon man, but upon* God, *who knows the secrets of our hearts.*

4. It is therefore fitting, that we should not only be called Christians, but be so. *As some call indeed their governor, Bishop; but yet do all things without him. But I can never think that such as these have a good conscience, seeing they are not gathered together thoroughly according to* God's *commandment.*

5. Seing then all things have an end, there are these two indifferently set before us, death and life; and every one shall depart unto his proper place. For as there are two sorts of coins, the one of God, the other of the world; and each of these has its proper inscription engraven upon it; so also is it here. The unbelievers are of this world; but the faithful, through charity, have the character of God the Father by Jesus Christ: by whom if we are not readily disposed to die after the likeness of his passion, his life is not in us.

6. Forasmuch therefore as I have in the persons before mentioned, seen all of you in faith and charity; *I exhort you that ye study to do all things in a divine concord: your Bishop presiding in the place of* God, *your Presbyters in the place of the council of the Apostles; and your Deacons most dear to me, being entrusted with the ministry of* Jesus Christ; who was with the Father before all ages, and appeared in the end to us. Wherefore taking the same holy course, see that ye all reverence one another: and

Digitized by Google

let no one look upon his neighbour after the flesh, but do you all mutually love each other in JESUS CHRIST. Let there be nothing that may be able to make a division among you; but be ye united to your Bishop, and those who preside over you, to be your pattern and direction in the way to immortality.

7. As therefore the LORD did nothing without the FATHER, being united to him; neither by himself nor yet by his Apostles; *so neither do ye do any thing without your Bishop and Presbyters:* neither endeavour to let any thing appear rational to yourselves apart; but being come together into the same place, have one common prayer; one supplication; one mind; one hope; in charity and in joy undefiled. There is one LORD JESUS CHRIST, than whom nothing is better. Wherefore come ye all together as unto one temple of GOD; as to one altar, as to one JESUS CHRIST: who proceeded from one FATHER, and exists in one, and is returned *to one.*

8. Be not deceived with strange doctrines; nor with old fables which are unprofitable. For if we still continue to live according to the Jewish law, we do confess ourselves not to have received grace. For even the most holy prophets lived according to CHRIST JESUS. And for this cause were they persecuted, being inspired by his grace, to convince the unbelievers and disobedient, that there is one GOD, who has manifested himself by JESUS CHRIST his SON; who is his eternal Word, not coming forth from silence; who in all things pleased him that sent him.[i]

9. Wherefore if they who were brought up in these ancient laws came nevertheless to the newness of hope; no longer observing Sabbaths, but keeping the LORD'S day, in which also our life is sprung up by him, and through his death, whom yet some deny, (by which mystery we have been brought to believe, and therefore wait that we may be found the disciples of JESUS CHRIST, our only master:) how shall we be able to live different from him; whose disciples the very prophets themselves being, did by the SPIRIT expect him as their master. And therefore he whom they justly waited for, being come, raised them up from the dead.[k]

10. Let us not then be insensible of his goodness; for should he have dealt with us according to our works, we had not now had a being. Wherefore being become his disciples, let us learn to live according to the rules of Christianity: for whosoever is called by any other name besides this, he is not of GOD. Lay aside therefore the old, and sour, and evil leaven; and be changed into the new leaven, which is JESUS CHRIST. Be ye salted in him, lest any one among you should be corrupted; for by your SAVIOUR ye shall be judged. It is absurd to name JESUS CHRIST, and to Judaize.—For the Christian religion did not embrace the Jewish, but the Jewish the Christian: that so every tongue that believed might be gathered together unto GOD.

11. These things, my beloved, I write unto you; not that I know of any among you that lie under this error: but as one of the least among you, I am desirous to forewarn you that ye fall not into the snares of vain doctrine, but that ye be fully instructed in the birth and suffering, and resurrection of JESUS CHRIST our hope; which was accomplished in the time of the government of Pontius Pilate, and that most truly and certainly; and from which GOD forbid that any among you should be turned aside.

12. May I therefore have joy of you in all things, if I shall be worthy of it. For though I am bound, yet am I not worthy to be compared to one of you that are at liberty. I know that ye are not puffed up; for ye have JESUS CHRIST in your hearts. And especially when I commend you, I

---

i John i. 1. k Mat. xxvii. 52.

Digitized by Google

know that ye are ashamed, as it is written, "the just man condemneth himself."[1]

13. Study therefore to be confirmed in the doctrine of our LORD, and of his Apostles; that so whatsoever ye do, ye may prosper both in body and spirit; in faith and charity, in the SON, and in the FATHER, and in the HOLY SPIRIT; in the beginning, and in the end: *together with your most worthy Bishop, and the well-wrought spiritual crown of your Presbytery; and your deacons which are according to* GOD. *Be subject to your Bishop*, and to one another, as JESUS CHRIST to the FATHER according to the flesh: and the Apostles both to CHRIST, and to the FATHER, and to the HOLY GHOST; that so ye may be united both in body and SPIRIT.

14. Knowing you to be full of GOD, I have the more briefly exhorted you. Be mindful of me in your prayers, that I may attain unto GOD; and of the Church that is in Syria, from which I am not worthy to be called. For I stand in need of your joint prayers in GOD, and of your charity, that the Church which is in Syria may be thought worthy to be nourished by your Church.

15. The Ephesians from Smyrna salute you, from which place I write unto you; being present here to the glory of GOD, in like manner as you are, who have in all things refreshed me: *together with Polycarp the Bishop of the Smyrneans.* The rest of the Churches, in the honour of JESUS CHRIST, salute you. Farewell, and be ye strengthened in the concord of GOD; enjoying his inseparable SPIRIT, which is JESUS CHRIST.

To the Magnesians.

EPISTLE OF ST. IGNATIUS

TO THE TRALLIANS.

Ignatius, who is also called Theophorus, to the holy Church which is at Tralles in Asia; beloved of GOD, the FATHER of JESUS CHRST; elect, and worthy of GOD, having peace through the flesh, and blood, and passion of JESUS CHRIST our hope; in the resurrection which is by him: which also I salute in its fulness, *continuing in the apostolical character;* wishing all joy and happiness unto it.

1. I HAVE heard of your blameless and constant disposition through patience, which not only appears in your outward conversation, but is naturally rooted, and grounded in you: in like manner as Polybius your Bishop has declared unto me; who came to me to Smyrna, by the will of GOD and JESUS CHRIST; and so rejoiced together with me in my bonds, for JESUS CHRIST, that in effect I saw your whole Church in him. Having therefore received the testimony of your good will towards me for GOD'S sake, by him; I seemed to find you, as also I knew that ye were, the followers of GOD.

2. *For whereas ye are subject to your Bishop as to* JESUS CHRIST, *ye appear to me to live not after the manner of men, but according to* JESUS CHRIST; who died for us, that so believing in his death, ye might escape

---

1 Prov. xviii. 17. In the Septuagint.

Digitized by Google

death. *It is therefore necessary, that as ye do so, so without your Bishop you should do nothing: also be ye subject to your Presbyters, as to the Apostles of* JESUS CHRIST *our hope; in whom if we walk, we shall be found in him. The Deacons also, as being the ministers of the mysteries of* JESUS CHRIST, *must by all means please all. For they are not the ministers of meat and drink, but of the Church of* GOD. *Wherefore they must avoid all offences as they would fire.*

3. In like manner let all reverence the Deacons as JESUS CHRIST; and the Bishop as the FATHER, and the Presbyters as the Sanhedrim of GOD, and college of the Apostles. Without these there is no *Church*. Concerning all which I am persuaded that ye think after the very same manner: for I have received, and even now have with me the pattern of your love, in your Bishop. Whose very look is instructive; and whose mildness powerful; whom I am persuaded the very atheists themselves cannot but reverence. But because I have a love towards you, I will not write any more sharply unto you about this matter, though I very well might; but now I have done so; lest being a condemned man, I should seem to prescribe to you as an Apostle.

4. I have great knowledge in GOD; but I refrain myself, lest I should perish in my boasting. For now I ought the more to fear, and not hearken to those that would puff me up. For they that speak to me, in my praise, chasten me. For I indeed desire to suffer, but I cannot tell whether I am worthy so to do. And this desire, though to others it does not appear, yet to myself it is for that very reason the more violent. I have, therefore, need of moderation; by which the prince of this world is destroyed.

5. Am I not able to write to you of heavenly things? but I fear lest I should harm you, who are yet but babes in CHRIST: (excuse me this care,) and lest perchance being not able to receive them, ye should be choaked with them. For even I myself, although I am in bonds, yet am not, therefore, able to understand heavenly things: as the places of the angels, and the several companies of them, under their respective princes; things visible and invisible; but in these I am yet a learner; for many things are wanting to us, that we come not short of GOD.

6. I exhort you, therefore, or rather not I, but the love of JESUS CHRIST, that ye use none but Christian nourishment; abstaining from pasture which is of another kind, I mean heresy. For they that are heretics, confound together the doctrine of JESUS CHRIST, with their own poison; whilst they seem worthy of belief: as men give a deadly potion mixed with sweet wine; which he who is ignorant of, does with the treacherous pleasure drink in his own death.

7. Wherefore guard yourselves against such persons. And that you will do, if you are not puffed up: *but continue inseparable from* JESUS CHRIST *our* GOD, *and from your Bishop, and from the commands of the Apostles.* He that is within the altar is pure; but he that is without, that is, *that does any thing without the Bishop, and Presbyters, and Deacons, is not pure in his conscience.*

8. Not that I know there is any thing of this nature among you; but I fore-arm you, as being greatly beloved by me, foreseeing the snares of the devil. Wherefore putting on meekness, renew yourselves in faith, that is the flesh of the LORD; and in charity, that is the blood of JESUS CHRIST. Let no man have any grudge against his neighbour. Give no occasion to the Gentiles; lest by means of a few foolish men, the whole congregation of GOD be evil spoken of. For woe to that man through whose vanity my name is blasphemed by any.

9. Stop your ears, therefore, as often as any one shall speak contrary to JESUS CHRIST; who was of the race of David, of the Virgin Mary: who

Digitized by Google

was truly born, and did eat and drink; was truly persecuted under Pontius Pilate; was truly crucified and dead; both those in heaven, and on earth, and under the earth being spectators of it. Who was also truly raised from the dead by his FATHER, after the same manner as he will also raise up us who believe in him, by CHRIST JESUS; without whom we have no true life.

10. But if, as some who are atheists, that is to say infidels, pretend, that he only seemed to suffer: (they themselves only seeming to exist) why then am I bound? why do I desire to fight with beasts? therefore do I die in vain: therefore I will not speak falsely against the LORD.

11. Flee, therefore, these evil sprouts which bring forth deadly fruit; of which if any one taste, he shall presently die. For these are not the plants of the FATHER; seeing if they were, they would appear to be the branches of the cross, and their fruit would be incorruptible: by which he invites you through his passion, who are members of him. For the head cannot be without its members, GOD having promised a union, that is himself.

12. I salute you from Smyrna, together with the Churches of GOD that are present with me; who have refreshed me in all things, both in the flesh and in the SPIRIT. My bonds which I carry about me for the sake of CHRIST, (beseeching him that I may attain unto GOD) exhort you that you continue in concord among yourselves, and in prayer with one another. *For it becomes every one of you*, ESPECIALLY THE PRESBYTERS, *to refresh the Bishop, to the honour of the* FATHER, *of* JESUS CHRIST, *and of the Apostles.* I beseech you that ye hearken to me in love, that I may not by those things which I write, rise up in witness against you. Pray also for me; who through the mercy of GOD stand in need of your prayers, that I may be worthy of the portion which I am about to obtain, that I be not found a reprobate.

13 The love of those who are at Smyrna and Ephesus salute you. Remember in your prayers the Church of Syria, from which I am not worthy to be called, being one of the least of it. *Fare ye well in* JESUS CHRIST; *being subject to your Bishop as to the command of* GOD: *and so likewise to the Presbytery.* Love every one his brother with an unfeigned heart. My soul be your expiation, not only now, but when I shall have attained unto GOD: for I am yet under danger. But the FATHER is faithful in JESUS CHRIST, to fulfil both mine and your petition: in whom may ye be found unblameable.

To the Trallians.

EPISTLE OF ST. IGNATIUS

TO THE ROMANS.

Ignatius, who is also called Theophorus, to the Church which has obtained mercy from the majesty of the Most High FATHER, and his only begotten SON JESUS CHRIST; beloved, and illuminated through the will of Him who willeth all things which are according to the love of JESUS CHRIST our GOD; which also presides in the place of the region of the Romans; and which I salute in the name of JESUS CHRIST, [as being] united both in flesh and SPIRIT to all his commands, and filled with the grace of GOD; [all joy] in JESUS CHRIST our GOD:

1. FORASMUCH as I have at last obtained through my prayers to GOD, to see your faces, which I much desired to do; being bound in CHRIST JESUS,

Digitized by Google

I hope ere long to salute you, if it shall be the will of God to grant me to attain unto the end I long for. For the beginning is well disposed, if I shall but have grace, without hindrance, to receive what is appointed for me. But I fear your love lest it do me an injury. For it is easy for you to do what you please; but it will be hard for me to attain unto God if you spare me.

2. But I would not that ye should please men, but God; whom also ye do please. For neither shall I ever hereafter have such an opportunity of going unto God; nor will you, if ye shall now be silent, ever be entitled to a better work. For if you shall be silent in my behalf, I shall be made partaker of God. But if you shall love my body, I shall have my course again to run. Wherefore ye cannot do me a greater kindness than to suffer me to be sacrificed unto God, now that the altar is already prepared: that when ye shall be gathered together in love, ye may give thanks to the Father through Christ Jesus, that he has vouchsafed to bring a Bishop of Syria unto you, being called from the east unto the west. For it is good for me to set from the world unto God; that I may rise again unto him.

3. Ye have never envied any one; ye have taught others. I would therefore that ye should now do these things yourselves, which in your instructions you have prescribed to others. Only pray for me, that God would give me both inward and outward strength, that I may not only say, but will; nor only called a Christian, but be found one. For if I shall be found a Christian, I may then deservedly be called one: and be thought faithful, when I shall no longer appear to the world. Nothing is good, that is seen. For even our God, Jesus Christ, now that he is in the Father, does so much the more appear. A Christian is not a work of opinion; but of greatness of mind, [especially when he is hated by the world.]

4. I write to the Churches, and signify to them all, that I am willing to die for God, unless you hinder me. I beseech you that you show not an unseasonable good will towards me. Suffer me to be food to the wild beasts by whom I shall attain unto God. For I am the wheat of God; and shall be ground by the teeth of the wild beasts, that I may be found the pure bread of Christ. Rather encourage the beasts, that they may become my sepulchre; and may leave nothing of my body; that being dead, I may not be troublesome to any. Then shall I be truly the disciple of Jesus Christ, when the world shall not see so much as my body. Pray, therefore, unto Christ for me, that by these instruments I may be made the sacrifice of God. I do not, as Peter and Paul, command you. They were Apostles, I a condemned man; they were free, but I am even to this day a servant: but if I suffer, I shall then become the freeman of Jesus Christ, and shall rise free. And now, being in bonds, I learn not to desire any thing.

5. From Syria even unto Rome, I fight with beasts both by sea and land; both night and day: being bound to ten leopards, that is to say, to such a band of soldiers; who though treated with all manner of kindness, are the worse for it. But I am the more instructed by their injuries; "yet am I therefore not justified."[m] May I enjoy the wild beasts that are prepared for me; which also I wish may exercise all their fierceness upon me: and whom for that end I will encourage, that they may be sure to devour me, and not serve me as they have done some, whom out of fear they have not touched. But and if they will not do it willingly, I will provoke them to it. Pardon me in this matter; I know what is profitable for me. Now I begin to be a disciple:[n] nor shall any thing move me, whether visible or invisible, that I may attain to Christ Jesus. Let fire, and the cross; let the companies of wild beasts, let breakings of bones, and tearing of members; let the

m 1 Cor. iv. 4.

n Luke xiv. 27.

Digitized by Google

shattering in pieces of the whole body, and all the wicked torments of the devil come upon me, only let me enjoy JESUS CHRIST.

6. All the ends of the world, and the kingdoms of it, will profit me nothing: I would rather die for JESUS CHRIST, than rule to the utmost ends of the earth. Him I seek who died for us: Him I desire that rose again for us. This is the gain that is laid up for me. Pardon me, my brethren, ye shall not hinder me from living: [nor seeing I desire to go to GOD, may you separate me from him, for the sake of this world; nor seduce me by any of the desires of it.] Suffer me to enter into pure light; where being come, I shall be indeed the servant of GOD. Permit me to imitate the passion of my GOD. If any one has him within himself, let him consider what I desire; and let him have compassion on me, as knowing how I am straightened.

7. The prince of this world would fain carry me away, and corrupt my resolution towards my GOD. Let none of you, therefore, help him: rather do ye join with me, that is, with GOD. Do not speak with JESUS CHRIST, and yet covet the world. Let not any envy dwell with you: no not though I myself when I shall be come unto you, should exhort you to it, yet do not ye hearken to me; but rather believe what I now write to you. For though I am alive at the writing this, yet my desire is to die. My love is crucified; [and the fire that is within me does not desire any water; but being alive and springing within me, says,] come to the FATHER. I take no pleasure in the food of corruption, nor in the pleasures of this life. I desire the bread of GOD, which is the flesh of JESUS CHRIST, [of the seed of David; and the drink that I long for] is his blood, which is incorruptible love.

8. I have no desire to live any longer after the manner of men, neither shall I, if you consent. Be ye therefore willing, that ye yourselves also may be pleasing to GOD. I exhort you in a few words; I pray you believe me. JESUS CHRIST will show you that I speak truly. My mouth is without deceit, and the FATHER hath truly spoken by it. Pray therefore for me, that I may accomplish what I desire. I have not written to you after the flesh, but according to the will of GOD. If I shall suffer, ye have loved me: but if I shall be rejected, ye have hated me.

9. Remember in your prayers the Church of Syria, which now enjoys GOD for its shepherd instead of me: let JESUS CHRIST only oversee it, and your charity. But I am even ashamed to be reckoned as one of them: for neither am I worthy, being the least among them, and as one born out of due season. But through mercy I have obtained to be somebody, if I shall get unto GOD.[o] My spirit salutes you; and the charity of the Churches that have received me in the name of JESUS CHRIST; not as a passenger; for even they that were not near to me in the way, have gone before me to the next city to meet me.

10. These things I write to you from Smyrna, by the most worthy of the Church of Ephesus. There is now with me, together with many others, Crocus, most beloved of me. As for those which are come from Syria, and are gone before me to Rome, to the glory of GOD, I suppose you are not ignorant of them. Ye shall therefore signify to them that I draw near, for they are all worthy both of GOD, and of you: whom it is fit that you refresh in all things. This have I written to you, the day before the ninth of the calends of September. Be strong unto the end in the patience of JESUS CHRIST.

To the Romans.

---

o 1 Cor. xv. 8.

Digitized by Google

EPISTLE OF ST. IGNATIUS

TO THE PHILADELPHIANS.

Ignatius, who is also called Theophorus, to the Church of God THE FATHER, and our LORD JESUS CHRIST, which is at Philadelphia in Asia; which has obtained mercy, being fixed in the concord of God, and rejoicing evermore in the passion of our LORD, and being fulfilled in all mercy through his resurrection; which also I salute in the blood of JESUS CHRIST, which is our eternal and undefiled joy; *especially if they are at unity with the Bishop, and Presbyters who are with him, and the Deacons appointed according to the mind of* JESUS CHRIST; whom he has settled according to his own will in all firmness by his HOLY SPIRIT.

1. *Which Bishop I know obtained that great ministry among you, not of himself, neither by men, nor out of vain glory, but by the love of* GOD THE FATHER, *and our* LORD JESUS CHRIST: whose moderation I admire; who by his silence is able to do more than others by their vain talk. For he is fitted to the commands, as the harp to its strings. Wherefore my soul esteems his mind towards GOD most happy, knowing it to be fruitful in all virtue, and perfect; full of constancy; free from passion, and according to all the moderation of the living GOD.

2. Wherefore as becomes the children both of the light and of truth; flee divisions and false doctrines: but where your shepherd is, there do ye, as sheep, follow after. For there are many wolves who seem worthy of belief, that with a false pleasure lead captive those that run in the course of GOD: but in your concord, they shall find no place.

3. Abstain therefore from those evil herbs which JESUS CHRIST does not dress; because such are not the plantation of the FATHER. Not that I have found any division among you, but rather all manner of purity. *For as many as are of* GOD, *and of* JESUS CHRIST, *are also with their Bishop.* And as many as shall with repentance return into the unity of the Church, even these shall also be the servants of GOD, that they may live according to JESUS CHRIST. *Be not deceived, brethren: if any one follows him that makes a schism in the Church, he shall not inherit the kingdom of* GOD. *If any one walks after any other opinion, he agrees not with the passion of* CHRIST.

4. Wherefore let it be your endeavour to partake all of the same holy Eucharist. For there is but one flesh of our LORD JESUS CHRIST; and one cup, in the unity of his blood; one altar; *as also there is one Bishop, together with* HIS *Presbytery, and the Deacons, my fellow-servants*: that so whatsoever ye do, ye may do it according to the will of GOD.

5. My brethren, the love I have towards you makes me the more large; and having a great joy in you, I endeavour to secure you against danger: or rather not I, but JESUS CHRIST; in whom being bound I the more fear, as being yet only on the way to suffering. But your prayer to GOD shall make me perfect, that I may attain to that portion, which by GOD's mercy is allotted to me: fleeing to the Gospel as to the flesh of CHRIST; and to the Apostles as to the Presbytery of the Church. Let us also love the prophets, forasmuch as they also have led us to the Gospel, and to the hope in CHRIST, and to expect him. In whom also believing they were saved, in the unity of JESUS CHRIST; being holy men, worthy to be loved, and had in wonder; who have received testimony from JESUS CHRIST, and are numbered in the Gospel of our common hope.

Digitized by Google

6. But if any one shall preach the Jewish Law unto you, hearken not unto him: for it is better to receive the doctrine of CHRIST from one that has been circumcised, than Judaism from one that has not. But if either the one or other do not speak concerning CHRIST JESUS, they seem to be but as monuments and sepulchres of the dead, upon which are written only the names of men. Flee therefore the wicked arts and snares of the prince of this world; lest at any time being oppressed by his cunning, ye grow cold in your charity. But come altogether into the same place, with an undivided heart. And, I bless my GOD that I have a good conscience towards you, and that no one among you has whereof to boast, either openly or privately, that I have been burthensome to him in much or little. And I wish to all amongst whom I have conversed, that it may not turn to a witness against them.

7. For although some would have deceived me according to the flesh; yet the SPIRIT being from GOD, is not deceived: for it knows both whence it comes, and whither it goes, and reproves the secrets of the heart. *I cried whilst I was among you; I spake with a loud voice; attend to the Bishop and to the Presbytery, and to the Deacons.* Now some supposed that I spake this as foreseeing the division that should come among you. But He is my witness for whose sake I am in bonds, that I knew nothing from any man. *But the* SPIRIT *spake, saying on this wise; do nothing without the Bishop: keep your bodies as the temples of* GOD: *love unity: flee divisions: be the followers of* CHRIST, *as he was of his* FATHER.

8. I therefore did as became me, as a man composed to unity. *For where there is division and wrath,* GOD *dwelleth not. But the* LORD *forgives all that repent, if they return to the unity of* GOD, *and to the counsel of the Bishop.* For I trust in the grace of JESUS CHRIST that he will free you from every bond. Nevertheless I exhort you that you do nothing out of strife, but according to the instruction of CHRIST. Because I have heard of some who say; Unless I find it written in the originals, I will not believe it to be written in the Gospel. And when I said, It is written; they answered what lay before them in their corrupted copies. But to me JESUS CHRIST is instead of all the uncorrupted monuments in the world: together with those undefiled monuments, his cross, and death, and resurrection, and the faith which is by him: by which I desire, through your prayers, to be justified.

9. The priests indeed are good: but much better is the High Priest to whom the holy of holies has been committed, and who alone has been entrusted with the secrets of GOD. He is the door of the FATHER; by which Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and all prophets enter in; as well as the Apostles and the Church. And all these things tend to the unity which is of GOD. Howbeit the Gospel has somewhat in it far above all other dispensations; namely, the appearance of our SAVIOUR, the LORD JESUS CHRIST, his passion and resurrection. For the beloved prophets referred to him: but the Gospel is the perfection of incorruption. All therefore together are good, if ye believe with charity.

10. Now as concerning the Church of Antioch which is in Syria, seeing I am told that through your prayers, and the bowels which ye have towards it in JESUS CHRIST, it is in peace; *it will become you, as the Church of* GOD, *to ordain some Deacon to go to them thither as the ambassador of* GOD; *that he may rejoice with them when they meet together, and glorify* GOD'S *name. Blessed be that man in* JESUS CHRIST, *who shall be found worthy of such a ministry; and ye yourselves also shall be glorified.* Now if ye be willing, it is not impossible for you to do this for the sake of GOD; as also the other neighbouring Churches have sent them, some Bishops, some Priests, and Deacons.

Digitized by Google

11. *As concerning Philo, the Deacon of Cilicia, a most worthy man, he still ministers unto me in the word of* God; together with Rheus of Agathopolis, a singular good person, who has followed me even from Syria, not regarding his life: these also bear witness unto you. And I myself give thanks to God for you, that ye receive them as the Lord shall receive you. But for those that dishonoured them, may they be forgiven through the grace of Jesus Christ. The charity of the brethren that are at Troas salutes you: from whence also I now write by Burrhus, who was sent together with me by those of Ephesus and Smyrna, for respect sake. May our Lord Jesus Christ honour them; in whom they hope, both in flesh, and soul, and spirit; in faith, in love, in unity. Farewell in Christ Jesus our common hope.

EPISTLE OF ST. IGNATIUS

TO THE SMYRNEANS.

Ignatius, who is also called Theophorus, to the Church of God the Father, and of the beloved Jesus Christ; which God hath mercifully blessed with every good gift, being filled with faith and charity; so that it is wanting in no gift; most worthy of God and fruitful in saints; the Church which is at Smyrna in Asia; all joy, through his immaculate Spirit and the word of God:

1. I glorify God, even Jesus Christ, who has given you such wisdom. For I have observed that you are settled in an immoveable faith, as if you were nailed to the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, both in the flesh and in the spirit; and are confirmed in love through the blood of Christ; being fully persuaded of those things which relate unto our Lord: who truly was of the race of David according to the flesh, but the Son of God according to the will and power of God: truly born of the Virgin, and baptized of John, that so "all righteousness might be fulfilled by him."[p] He was also truly crucified by Pontius Pilate and Herod the Tetrarch, being nailed for us in the flesh; by the fruits of which we are, even by his most blessed passion; that he might set up a token for all ages through his resurrection, to all his holy and faithful servants, whether they be Jews or Gentiles, in one body of his Church.

2. Now all these things he suffered for us, that we might be saved. And he suffered truly, as he also truly raised up himself: and not, as some unbelievers say, that he only seemed to suffer, they themselves only seeming to be. And as they believe, so shall it happen unto them; when being divested of the body they shall become mere spirits.

3. But I know that even after his resurrection he was in the flesh; and I believe that he is still so. And when he came to those who were with Peter, he said unto them, 'take, handle me, and see that I am not an incorporeal dæmon.' And straightway they felt him and believed; being convinced both by his flesh and spirit. For this cause they despised death, and were found to be above it. But after his resurrection he did eat and drink with them, as he was flesh; although as to his spirit he was united to the Father.

---

p Matt. iii. 15.

Digitized by Google

4. Now these things, beloved, I put you in mind of, not questioning but that you yourselves also believe that they are so. But I arm you beforehand against certain beasts in the shape of men; whom you must not only not receive, but if it be possible must not meet with. Only you must pray for them, that if it be the will of God they may repent; which yet will be very hard. But of this our Lord Jesus Christ has the power, who is our true life. For if all these things were done only in show by our Lord, then do I also seem only to be bound: and why have I given up myself to death, to the fire, to the sword, to wild beasts? But now the nearer I am to the sword, the nearer I am to God! when I shall come among the wild beasts, I shall come to God. Only in the name of Jesus Christ, I undergo all to suffer together with him; he who was made a perfect man strengthening me.

5. Whom some, not knowing, do deny; or rather have been denied by him, being the advocates of death, rather than of the truth. Whom neither the prophecies, nor the law of Moses have persuaded; nor the Gospel itself even to this day, nor the sufferings of every one of us. For they think also the same things of us.—For what does a man profit me, if he shall praise me, and blaspheme my Lord; not confessing that he was truly made man? now he that doth not say this, does in effect deny him, and is in death. But for the names of such as do this, they being unbelievers, I thought it not fitting to write them unto you. Yea, God forbid that I should make any mention of them, until they shall repent to a true belief of Christ's passion, which is our resurrection.

6. Let no man deceive himself; both the things which are in heaven, and the glorious angels, and princes, whether visible or invisible, if they believe not in the blood of Christ, it shall be to them to condemnation. "He that is able to receive this, let him receive it."[q] Let no man's place or state in the world puff him up; that which is worth all is faith and charity, to which nothing is to be preferred. But consider those who are of a different opinion from us, as to what concerns the grace of Jesus Christ which is come unto us, how contrary they are to the design of God! they have no regard to charity; no care of the widow, the fatherless, and the oppressed; of the bound or free, of the hungry or thirsty.

7. They abstain from the Eucharist, and from the public offices; because they confess not the Eucharist to be the flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ; which suffered for our sins, and which the Father of his goodness, raised again from the dead. And for this cause contradicting the gift of God, they die in their disputes: but much better would it be for them to receive it, that they might one day rise through it. It will therefore become you to abstain from such persons; and not to speak with them neither in private nor in public; but to hearken to the prophets, and especially to the Gospel, in which both Christ's passion is manifested unto us, and his resurrection perfectly declared. But flee all divisions as the beginning of evils.

8. *See that ye all follow your Bishop, as* Jesus Christ, *the* Father: *and the Presbytery, as the Apostles. And reverence the Deacons as the command of* God. *Let no man do any thing of what belongs to the Church separately from the Bishop. Let that Eucharist be looked upon as well established, which is either offered by the Bishop, or by him to whom the Bishop has given his consent. Wheresoever the Bishop shall appear, there let the people also be: as where* Jesus Christ *is, there is the catholic Church. It is not lawful without the Bishop, neither to baptize, nor to celebrate the holy communion; but whatsoever he shall approve of, that is also pleasing unto* God: *that so whatever is done may be sure and well done.*

---

q Matt. xix. 12.

Digitized by Google

9. For what remains, it is very reasonable that we should repent, whilst there is yet time to return unto God. *It is a good thing to have a due regard both to* God *and to the Bishop: he that honours the Bishop, shall be honoured of* God. *But he that does any thing without his knowledge, ministers unto the devil.* Let all things therefore abound to you in charity; seeing ye are worthy. Ye have refreshed me in all things; so shall Jesus Christ you. Ye have loved me both when I was present with you, and now being absent, ye cease not to do so. May God be your reward, for whom whilst ye undergo all things, ye shall attain unto him.

10. Ye have done well in that ye have received Philo, and Rheus Agathopus, who followed me for the word of God, as the Deacons of Christ our God. Who also give thanks unto the Lord for you, forasmuch as ye have refreshed them in all things. Nor shall any thing that ye have done, be lost to you. My soul be for yours, and my bonds which ye have not despised, nor been ashamed of. Wherefore neither shall Jesus Christ, our perfect faith, be ashamed of you.

11. Your prayer is come to the Church of Antioch which is in Syria. From whence being sent bound with chains becoming God, I salute the Churches: being not worthy to be called from thence, as being the least among them. Nevertheless by the will of God I have been thought worthy of this honour; not for that I think I have deserved it, but by the grace of God; which I wish may be perfectly given unto me, that through your prayers I may attain unto God. And therefore that your work may be fully accomplished upon earth and in heaven; it will be fitting, and for the honour of God, that your Church appoint some worthy delegate who being come as far as Syria, may rejoice together with them that they are in peace; and that they are again restored to their former state, and have again received their proper body. Wherefore I should think it a worthy action, to send some one from you with an Epistle, to congratulate with them their peace in God; and that through your prayers they have now gotten to their harbour. For inasmuch as ye are perfect yourselves, you ought to think those things that are perfect. For when you are desirous to do well, God is ready to enable you thereunto.

12. The love of the brethren that are at Troas salutes you; from whence I write to you by Burrhus whom ye sent with me, together with the Ephesians your brethren; and who has in all things refreshed me. And I would to God that all would imitate him, as being a pattern of the ministry of God. May his grace fully reward him. *I salute your very worthy Bishop, and your venerable Presbytery; and your Deacons, my fellow-servants;* and all of you in general, and every one in particular, in the name of Jesus Christ, and in his flesh and blood; in his passion and resurrection both fleshly and spiritually; and in the unity of God with you. Grace be with you, and mercy, and peace, and patience for ever more.

13. I salute the families of my brethren, with their wives and children; and the virgins that are called widows. Be strong in the power of the Holy Ghost. Philo, who is present with me, salutes you. I salute the house of Tavias, and pray that it may be strengthened in faith and charity, both of flesh and spirit. I salute Alce, my well beloved, together with the incomparable Daphnus, and Eutechnus, and all by name. Farewell in the grace of God.

To the Smyrneans from Troas.

Digitized by Google

EPISTLE OF ST. IGNATIUS

TO ST. POLYCARP.

Ignatius, who is also called Theophorus, to Polycarp, Bishop of the Church which is at Smyrna: their overseer, but rather himself overlooked by God THE FATHER, and the LORD JESUS CHRIST: all happiness.

1. HAVING known that thy mind towards GOD is fixed as it were upon an immoveable rock, I exceedingly give thanks that I have been thought worthy to behold thy blessed face, in which may I always rejoice in GOD. Wherefore I beseech thee by the grace of GOD with which thou art clothed, to press forward in thy course, and to exhort all others that they may be saved. Maintain thy place with all care both of flesh and spirit; make it thy endeavour to preserve unity, than which nothing is better. Bear with all men, even as the LORD with thee. Support all in love, as also thou dost. Pray without ceasing; ask more understanding than what thou already hast. Be watchful, having thy spirit always awake. Speak to every one according as GOD shall enable thee. Bear the infirmities of all, as a perfect combatant: where the labour is great, the gain is the more.

2. If thou shalt love the good disciples, what thanks is it? but rather do thou subject to thee those that are mischievous, in meekness. Every wound is not healed with the same plaister: if the accessions of the disease be vehement, mollify them with soft remedies: be in all things, "wise as a serpent but harmless as a dove." For this cause thou art composed of flesh and spirit; that thou mayest mollify those things that appear before thy face: and as for those that are not seen, pray to GOD that he would reveal them unto thee, that so thou mayest be wanting in nothing, but mayest abound in every gift. The times demand thee, as the pilots the winds; and he that is tossed in a tempest, the haven where he would be; that thou mayest attain unto GOD. Be sober as the combatant of GOD: the crown proposed to thee is immortality, and eternal life; concerning which thou art also fully persuaded. I will be thy surety in all things, and my bonds, which thou hast loved.

3. Let not those that seem worthy of credit, but teach other doctrines, disturb thee. Stand firm and immoveable, as an anvil when it is beaten upon. It is the part of a brave combatant, to be wounded, and yet overcome. But especially we ought to endure all things for GOD's sake, that he may bear with us.—Be every day better than other: consider the times; and expect him who is above all time, eternal, invisible, though for our sakes made visible; impalpable, and impassible, yet for us subjected to sufferings; enduring all manner of ways for our salvation.

4. Let not the widows be neglected: be thou, after GOD, their guardian. *Let nothing be done without thy knowledge and consent*; neither do thou any thing but according to the will of GOD; as also thou dost with all constancy. Let your assemblies be more full; inquire into all by name. Overlook not the men and maid servants; neither let them be puffed up; but rather let them be the more subject to the glory of GOD, that they may obtain for him a better liberty. Let them not desire to be set free at the public cost, that they be not slaves to their own lusts.

5. Flee evil arts, or rather make not any mention of them. Say to my sisters, that they love the LORD; and be satisfied with their own husbands, both in the flesh and spirit. In like manner, exhort my brethren in the name of JESUS CHRIST, that they "love their wives, even as the LORD the Church." If any man can remain in a virgin state, to the honour of the flesh of CHRIST,

Digitized by Google

let him remain without boasting: but if he boast, he is undone. And if he desire to be more taken notice of than the Bishop, he is corrupted. But it becomes all such as are married, whether men or women, to come together with the consent of the Bishop, that so their marriage may be according to godliness, and not in lust. Let all things be done to the honour of GOD.

6. *Hearken unto the Bishop, that* GOD *also may hearken unto you. My soul be security for them that submit to their Bishop, with their Presbyters and Deacons.* And may my portion be together with theirs in GOD. Labour with one another, contend together, run together, suffer together, sleep together, and rise together, as the stewards, and assessors, and ministers of GOD. Please him under whom you war; and from whom you receive your wages. Let none of you be found a deserter; but let your baptism remain as your arms, your faith as your helmet, your charity as your spear, your patience as your whole armour. Let your works be your charge, that so you may receive a suitable reward. Be long-suffering therefore towards each other in meekness, as GOD is towards you. Let me have joy of you in all things.

7. Now forasmuch as the Church of Antioch in Syria is, as I am told, in peace through your prayers; I also have been the more comforted and without care in GOD; if so be that by suffering, I shall attain unto GOD; that through your prayers I may be found a disciple of CHRIST. It will be very fit, O most worthy Polycarp, to call a select council, and choose some one whom ye particularly love, and who is patient of labour, that he may be the messenger of GOD: and that going unto Syria, he may glorify your incessant love, to the praise of CHRIST. A Christian has not the power of himself; but must be always at leisure for GOD's service. Now this work is both GOD's and yours, when ye shall have perfected it. For I trust through the grace of GOD that ye are ready to every good work that is fitting for you in the LORD. Knowing therefore your earnest affection for the truth, I have exhorted you by these short letters.

8. But forasmuch as I have not been able to write to all the Churches, because I must suddenly sail from Troas to Neapolis: (for so is the command of those to whose pleasure I am subject;) do you write to the Churches that are near you, as being instructed in the will of GOD, that they also may do in like manner. Let those that are able send messengers; and let the rest send their letters by those who shall be sent by you; that you may be glorified to all eternity, of which you are worthy. I salute all by name; particularly the wife of Epitropus, with all her house, and children. I salute Attalus my well beloved. I salute him, who shall be thought worthy to be sent by you into Syria. Let grace be ever with him, and with Polycarp who sends him. I wish you all happiness in our GOD, JESUS CHRIST; in whom continue in the unity, and protection of GOD. I salute Alce my well beloved. Farewell in the LORD.

Digitized by Google

APPENDIX II.

The following are extracts from authors quoted in the preceding pages, in the Latin, as promised. The number of the Section in which they are quoted in English, is placed at the commencement of each extract, except the first which is quoted in Section 130. In some cases only the more important parts of the quotation are given.

D. IRENÆI ADVERSUS HÆRESES, LIB. III.

De Apostolorum Traditione, vel ab Apostolis in Ecclesiis Episcoporum Successione.

CAPUT. III.

Traditionem itaque Apostolorum in toto mundo manifestatam, in [omni] Ecclesia adest perspicere omnibus qui vera velint audire, & habemus annumerare eos qui ab Apostolis instituti sunt Episcopi in Ecclesiis, & successores eorum usque ad nos, qui nihil tale docuerunt, neque cognoverunt quale ab his deliratur. Etenim si recondita mysteria scissent Apostoli, quæ seorsim & latenter ab reliquis perfectos docebant, his vel maxime traderent ea quibus etiam ipsas Ecclesias committebant. Valde enim perfectos & irreprehensibiles in omnibus eos volebant esse, quos & successores relinquebant suum ipsorum locum magisterii tradentes, quibus emendate agentibus fieret magna utilitas, lapsis autem summa calamitas. Sed quoniam valde longum est, in hoc tali volumine omnium Ecclesiarum enumerare successiones, maximæ, & antiquissimæ, et omnibus cognitæ, a gloriosissimis duobus Apostolis Petro & Paulo Romæ fundatæ et constitutæ Ecclesiæ, eam quam habet ab Apostolis traditionem, & annunciatam hominibus fidem, per successiones Episcoporum pervenientem usque ad nos, indicantes, confundimus omnes eos, qui quoquo modo vel per sui placentiam malam, vel vanam gloriam, vel per cæcitatem & malam sententiam, præterquam oportet, colligunt. Ad hanc enim Ecclesiam propter potentiorem principalitatem, necesse est omnem convenire Ecclesiam, hoc est, eos qui sunt undique fideles, in qua semper ab his qui sunt undique, conservata est ea quæ est ab Apostolis traditio. Fundantes igitur & instruentes beati Apostoli Ecclesiam, Lino episcopatum administrandæ Ecclesiæ tradiderunt. Hujus Lini Paulus in his quæ sunt ad Timotheum epistolis meminit. Succedit autem ei Anacletus, post eum tertio loco ab Apostolis episcopatum sortitur Clemens, qui & vidit ipsos Apostolos, & contulit cum eis, cum adhuc insonantem prædicationem Apostolorum, & traditionem ante oculos haberet. Non solus enim, adhuc multi supererant, tunc ab Apostolis docti.

Sub hoc igitur Clemente, dissensione non modica inter eos qui Corinthi essent fratres facta, scripsit quæ est Romæ Ecclesia potentissimas literas Corinthiis, ad pacem eos congregans, & reparans fidem eorum, & annuncians quam in recenti ab Apostolis receperant traditionem, annunciantem unum Deum omnipotentem, factorem cæli & terræ, plasmatorem hominis, qui induxerit cataclysmum, & advocaverit Abraham, qui eduxerit populum de terra Ægypti, qui colloquutus sit Moysi, qui legem disposuerit, & Prophetas miserit, qui ignem præparaverit diabolo & angelis ejus.

Digitized by Google

Hunc Patrem Domini nostri Iesu Christi ab Ecclesiis annunciari, ex ipsa Scriptura qui velint, discere possunt; & apostolicam Ecclesiæ traditionem intelligere, cum sit vetustior Epistola his qui nunc falso docent, & alterum Deum super *Demiurgum* & factorem horum omnium quæ sunt, commentiuntur. Huic autem Clementi succedit Euaristus, & Euaristo Alexander, ac deinceps sextus ab Apostolis constitutus est Sixtus, & ab hoc Telesphorus, qui etiam gloriosissime martyrium fecit, ac deinceps Hyginus, post Pius, post quem Anicetus. Cum autem successisset Aniceto Soter, nunc duodecimo loco Episcopatum ab Apostolis habet Eleutherius. Hac ordinatione & successione, ea quæ est ab Apostolis in Ecclesia traditio, & veritatis præconiatio pervenit usque ad nos. Et est plenissima hæc ostensio, unam & eandem vivificatricem fidem esse, quæ in Ecclesia ab Apostolis usque nunc sit conservata, & tradita in veritate.

Et Polycarpus autem non solum ab Apostolis edoctus, & conversatus cum multis ex eis qui Dominum nostrum viderunt: sed etiam ab Apostolis in Asia, in ea quæ est Smyrnis Ecclesia, constitutus Episcopus, quem & nos vidimus in prima nostra ætate: multum enim perseveraverat, & valde senex gloriosissime & nobilissime martyrium faciens exivit de hac vita. Hic docuit semper quæ ab Apostolis didicerat, quæ & Ecclesiæ tradidit, et sola sunt vera. Et testimonium his perhibent quæ sunt in Asia Ecclesiæ omnes, & qui usque adhuc successerunt Polycarpo: qui vir multo majoris authoritatis testis, & fidelior veritatis est testis, quam Valentinus, & Marcion, & reliqui qui sunt perversæ sententiæ. Is enim est qui sub Aniceto cum advenisset in urbem, multos ex his quos prædiximus, hæreticos convertit in Ecclesiam Dei, unam & solam hanc veritatem annuncians ab Apostolis percepisse se, quam & Ecclesiæ tradidit. Et sunt qui audierunt eum dicentem, quoniam Ioannes Domini discipulus in Epheso iens lavari, cum vidisset intus Cerinthum, exilierit de balneo non lotus, dicens quod timeat ne balneum concidat, cum intus esset Cerinthus inimicus veritatis. Et ipse autem Polycarpus Marcioni aliquando occurrenti sibi, & dicenti, Cognosce nos, respondit: Cognosco te primogenitum Satanæ. Tantum Apostoli, & horum discipuli habuerunt timorem, ne verbo tenus communicarent alicui eorum qui adulteraverant veritatem. quemadmodum & Paulus ait: Hæreticum autem hominem post unam correptionem devita, sciens quoniam perversus est qui est talis, & a semetipso damnatus. Est autem & epistola Polycarpi ad Philippenses scripta perfectissima, ex qua & characterem fidei ejus, & prædicationem veritatis, qui volunt & curam habent suæ salutis, possunt discere.

Sed & quæ est Ephesi Ecclesia a Paulo quidem fundata, Ioanne autem permanente apud eos usque ad Trajani tempora, testis est verus Apostolorum traditionis.

PASSAGES QUOTED IN VARIOUS SECTIONS.

468. "Sed Paulus ipse alibi se, non alios complures, Timotheo manus imposuisse commemorat. *Admoneo te* (inquit) *ut gratiam suscites quæ in te est per impositionem manuum mearum*. Nam quod in altera epistola de *impositione manuum presbyterii* dicitur, non ita accipio quasi Paulus de seniorum collegio loquatur: sed hoc nomine ordinationem ipsam intelligo; quasi diceret, Fac ut gratia quam per manuum impositionem recepisti, quum te Presbyterum crearem, non sit irrita."

The translation of this passage, given in §468 was taken from Allen's *Translation*, before I had seen Calvin's work in the original. It will be observed that the translation of the sentence, *Nam quod, &c.* in §468, attributes to Paul the expression "*of the laying on of the hands of the Presby-*

Digitized by Google

tery," at the same time that Calvin shows that he does not understand Paul as having spoken of a *Presbytery* in that passage. Calvin's words are: "For what is said in the other Epistle, (as if he had said, For the words in the other Epistle,) *de impositione manuum Presbyterii*, I do not understand as if Paul spoke of a college of Presbyters: but by this name, (viz. *Presbyterii*,) I understand the ordination itself: as if he had said, Take care that the grace which you have received by the laying on of hands, when I created you a Presbyter, be not in vain."

501. "Qui Apostolorum Hierosolymis erat, is munere fungebatur quo postea Episcopi, ideoque Presbyteros convocabat: nisi forte Jacobus hic fuit frater Domini, non Apostolus, sed Episcopus."

504. "At ordinatio nunquam nisi a pastoribus facta, et quidem antiquitus ab Episcopis solis. Hinc ad primum Ephesiorum Episcopum scribens Paulus monet (1 Tim. v. 22) *ne cui cito manus imponat*. Et canones antiquissimi, qui Apostolici vocantur, *Presbyterum* præcipiunt *ab Episcopo ordinari, Episcopum autem non nisi a duobus aut tribus Episcopis*."

507. "Episcopi vox explicatur, et ostenditur in hac quæstione significare Pastorem, qui Pastoribus præsit jure quodam perpetuo."

508. "Agimus autem primo loco de Episcopis, qua voce uti nobis liceat eo significatu, quo Synodi Universales ac topicæ, ac Patres universi perpetuo ea usi reperiuntur." ——————————— "Neque tamen eo minus proprio ac peculiari quodam jure iis addici potuit, qui et cum cæteris universi gregis et præter cæteros ipsorum pastorum *inspectores* essent constituti. Quare suo et alieno otio abutuntur, qui cum hanc questionem tractandam susceperint, operose probant commune fuisse pastoribus omnibus Episcopi nomen, cum ea vox multo etiam pateat latius. Neque minus illi aerem feriunt, qui magno conatu id agunt, ut probent omnibus omnino pastoribus res quasdam communes, jus scilicet prædicandi, sacramenta exhibendi, et si quid his adhæret. Non enim de his in quibus conveniunt, sed de ea, quæ ipsos distinguit, eminentia quæritur."

509. "De Episcopatu ergo, id est, unius pastoris inter cæteros eminentia, primum statuimus eum nulli juri divino repugnare. Si quis contra sentiat, hoc est, si quis totam veterem Ecclesiam condemnet stultitiæ aut etiam impietatis, ei procul dubio incumbit onus probandi;" &c.

"Ipsum diaconium ab Apostolis institutum satis arguit non esse a CHRISTO imperatum munerum ecclesiasticorum æqualitatem. Hoc ergo primum, et minime dubiæ veritatis ponamus, in quo Zanchium, Chemnitium, Hemingium, Calvinum, Melancthonem, Bucerum habemus consentientes; imo et Bezam, hactenus ut dicat, 'quod unus quispiam cæterorum judicio compresbyterorum delectus, Presbyterio προεστως (Præpositus) esset et permaneret' id reprehendi nec posse nec debere."

511. "Tertium hoc sit, episcopatum initium habuisse *apostolicis temporibus*. Testantur hoc catalogi Episcoporum apud Irenæum, Eusebium, Socratem, Theodoretum, atque alios, qui omnes incipiunt ab *apostolica ætate*. Tantis autem auctoribus, atque ita inter se consentientibus, fidem derogare in re historica, non est nisi irreverentis et pertinacis animi. Perinde enim id est, quasi neges verum esse quod omnes tradunt Romanorum historiæ, Consulatum cœpisse ab exactis Tarquiniis. Sed rursus Hieronymum audiamus; 'Alexandriæ,' inquit 'a Marco Evangelista Presbyteri unum semper ex se electum in celsiori gradu collocatum Episcopum nominabant.' Obiit Marcus octavo Neronis anno: cui vivente adhuc Johanne Apostolo successit

Digitized by Google

Anianus, Aniano Abilius, Abilio Cerdo; eodem Apostolo superstite post mortem Jacobi Simeon episcopatum Hierosolymitanum, post mortem Petri Paulique Romanum Linus, Anacletus, Clemens, Antiochenum vero Evodius et Ignatius gesserunt. Hæc certe non est spernenda antiquitas, cui Ignatius ipse, Apostolorum coævus, et qui hunc proxime sequuntur Justinus Martyr, et Ironæus, apertissima testimonia præbent, quæ transcribere nihil est opus. Cyprianus 'jam quidem,' inquit, 'per omnes Provincias et per urbes singulas constituti sunt Episcopi.'

512. "Quartum esto, Episcopnm hunc divino jure approbatum, aut (ut Bucerus loquitur) visum SPIRITUI SANCTO ut inter Presbyteros unus curam singularem gereret. Irrefragabile argumentum huic assertioni præbet divina Apocalypsis: ipse enim CHRISTUS scribi jubet *septem Angelis* Asiaticarum *ecclesiarum*. Qui per *Angelos* ipsas Ecclesias intelligunt, manifeste Sacris Literis contradicunt. Nam *Candelabra sunt Ecclesiæ* inquit CHRISTUS, *stellæ autem Angeli septem Ecclesiarum*." —— "CHRISTUS ergo scribens illis Episcopis, ut eminentibus in Clero, haud dubie eminentiam hanc episcopalem probavit."

513. "Quæri potest cum tam antiquum quoque, et ipsi CHRISTO approbatum sit munus eorum, qni perpetua quadam dignitate Presbyteris præerant, quo nomine is honor appellatus fuerit, antequam illud Episcoporum commune nomen huic præsidentiæ peculiariter tribui cœpit? Quod circa Neronis annum octavum contigisse putat Hieronymus: patres veteres hos Presbyterorum Principes putant *Apostolos* appellatos."

"*Angeli* nomen antiquitus ei datum, qui postea *Episcopus* dici cœpit, Apocalypsis evincit."

517. "Non audeo ad hujus rei confirmationem adferre Paulinum illud *de impositione manuum Presbyterii*, quia video Hieronymum, Ambrosium, aliosque veteres, et recentiorum omnium facile principem Calvinum, Presbyterium eo loco non *consessum*, sed *munus* ad quod promotus est Timotheus, interpretari: et sane qui in Conciliis et patrum scriptus sit exercitatus, ignorare non potest Presbyterium, ut Episcopatum, et Diaconatum nomina esse officiorum." (*Vide Sect.* 467, *notam.*) "Adde quod cum a Paulo *manus* Timotheo *impositas* constet." (*Vide Sect.* 469)

518. "Tertium hoc asseramus, non leves fuisse causas, cur hoc sæculo nonnullis in locis episcopatus certe ad tempus aliquod omitteretur. Temporarias enim esse causas ipse Beza videtur agnoscere, cum non eum se esse dicit, qui veterem ordinem non restituendum existimaret, *si ruinæ Ecclesiæ restitutæ essent*. Inter has causas prima potuit esse penuria virorum, qui tam gravi muneri sufficerint;" &c. "Non debent quidem res bonæ damnari, quia sunt qui iis abutuntur; sed verso in morem abusu intermitti res ipsas non est infrequens."

"Tertia causa addi potest, quod infestissimis temporibus, magistri veritatis (eo nomine invisi) non culpam tantum ambitionis, sed et suspicionem omnem amoliri debuerant, quod cum sublata episcopali dignitate sollicite curaverint, ne sic quidem tamen calumniam effugerunt. Quid non audituri, si doctrinæ mutatio conjuncta fuisset cum majoris gradus adeptione? Adjiciam unam insuper causam cur initio repurgationis non admodum necessarius fuerit episcopatus. Excitarat Deus præstantes viros, summo ingenio, &c, horum summa apud omnes existimatio facile supplevit quod ab episcopatu deerat. Et (si cum Zanchio verum volumus agnoscere) re ipsa nulli magis Episcopi fuere quam illi ipsi quorum (quamvis hoc non agentium) auctoritas ad oppugnandum usque episcopatum valuit." I perceive that in the translation of this passage in Section 518, the words in the last parenthesis have been overlooked; they signify, *although not exercising this office.*

Digitized by Google

"Et has quidem ob causas excusari mihi posse videntur Ecclesiæ, quæ nullos Episcopos habent, dum tamen abstineant a sanctissimi moris improbatione, simulque illud retineant quod nullo modo omitti BEZA (*de Ministr. Evangel. Gradib.* cap. xxiii.) censuit his verbis; 'essentiale fuit, quod ex DEI ordinatione perpetua, necesse fuit, est, et erit, ut in Presbyterio quispiam et loco et dignitate primus actioni gubernandæ præsit cum eo, quod ipsi Divinitus attributum est, jure.'"

528. "Quibus ergo docendi munus injunctum erat, eos omnes nominabant Presbyteros. Illi ex suo numero in singulis civitatibus unum eligebant, cui specialiter dabant titulum Episcopi: ne ex æqualitate, ut fieri solet, dissidia nascerentur."

"Alibi tamen docet quam fuerit antiquum institutum: dicit enim Alexandriæ, a Marco Evangelista usque ad Heraclam et Dionysium, Presbyteros semper unum ex se electum in excelsiori gradu collocasse, quem Episcopum nominabant. Habebant ergo singulæ civitates Presbyterorum collegium, qui Pastores erant ac Doctores." "Unicuique civitati erat attributa certa regio, quæ Presbyteros inde sumeret, et velut corpori Ecclesiæ illius accenseretur. Singula (ut dixi) collegia politiæ tantum et pacis conservandæ gratia uni Episcopo suberant."

THE END.

Digitized by Google

INDEX.

The numbers refer to Sections, except when preceded by p.

A

Aerius condemned because he maintained that there ought to be no difference between a Bishop and a Presbyter, 510
Apostles had charge of the Churches, 45, 274, 275
Apostle, the title of not confined to the Twelve, 45, 47
Apostles afterwards called Bishops, 48, 56, 232, 513
Apostolic order of the Church binding on all Christians, 1

B

Bishops exercised the same power the Apostles did, 48—50, 53—57, 501
——— were the same order of ministers, 101—123, 127, 189, 250, 282
——— were appointed in all the Churches, by the Apostles, to be their successors in the government of the Church, 130, 185, 187, 206, 326
——— governed all the Churches, one Bishop at a time in each, 555
——— were appointed by Divine authority, 189, 194, 228, 509, 512
——— had a special ordination to the Bishop's office, 556
——— alone had the power of ordaining, 557
——— alone had the power of confirming, 247, &c.
——— were called the Chiefs of the Priests, and Apostles, 282
——— and Heads of the ministers of God, 337
——— only had a right to sit in General Councils, 337, 503
——— sent some of their Presbyters to represent them, if not able to attend, 337

C

Calvin only a Presbyter, and therefore destitute of authority to ordain, 371
——— admits that Bishops were appointed from the time of Mark, 528
——— that one Bishop was set over every city and the neighbouring region, and that the Presbyters were subject to him, 528
——— that Bishops ordained Bishops, and that every Bishop, with the Presbyters under him, ordained his own Presbyters, 532
——— wrote to the Duke of Somerset that he highly approved of a settled form of Prayer and of Ecclesiastical rites, 544
Calvin offered to restore episcopacy in the Churches under his influence, 545
Christians, private, deeply concerned in this question, 369, &c.
Church, consists of a Bishop, Presbyters, Deacons, and people, 188 & Ap. p. 392
Church, episcopal from the commencement, 338—357
——— continued so throughout the world until the sixteenth century, when a small portion rejected the orders of Bishops and Deacons, the Presbyters assuming the whole power, 358, 543
——— of Hindostan episcopal, 543
——— of Bohemia, having lost all their Bishops but one during a violent persecution in the seventeenth century, sent three Presbyters to the Waldensian Bishops who ordained them, 366
Clemens Alexandrinus, 169
Clemens Romanus, 165, &c.
Concessions of Episcopalians, 477, &c.
——— consist of opinions of individuals variously influenced by affection, by fear, &c. 477—481, 495
——— of some founded on an incorrect view of Jerome's account of the time when Bishops were appointed, 482
——— and upon an incorrect statement of Jerome's account of the practice of the Alexandrine Church, 483
——— of Stillingfleet, renounced when he became older, as totally untenable, 485 to 489
——— of Presbyterian writers are concessions of facts, 496, 554 to 559
——— of Blondel that there were Bishops in the Church in the year 140, 497
——— of Doddridge—in the time of Ignatius, viz. before the year 116, 500
——— of Peter Moulin, Baxter, Le Clerc, and Grotius, that Bishops were appointed in the time of the Apostles, (See Grotius,) 498 to 501
——— of Zanchius, Calvin, Beza, and others, that one certain person was set over the Presbyters, and that permanently, (See Calvin, above,) 509
——— of Neal, that the English Dissenters separated from the Church because of objections to the Litany, the Surplice, and Kneeling at the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper; and that several refused bishoprics on this account only, 537, &c.

D

Deacons preached and baptized, 183, 247, 248

Digitized by Google

E

Eusebius' testimony, 303, &c.
——— mentions the successors of the Apostles, 305
——— promises to give them "in the time in which every one succeeded," 311
——— had abundance of written testimony as to facts, 321—325
——— evidence of the successions of Bishops, of the same kind as that of the authenticity of the books of the New Testament, 323 to 325
——— mentions, as he promised, the Bishops who from time to time succeeded in all the principal Churches, of which see specimens in 326, 329 to 337

G

Grotius admits that the Bishop was a Pastor who presided over the other Pastors by a perpetual right, 507, 508
——— that the episcopate, or office of Bishop, was repugnant to no Divine Law, and was received by the whole Church, 509—510
——— that Aerius was condemned because he said that a Presbyter ought not to be distinguished from a Bishop, 510
——— that Jerome speaks of this doctrine as an error, 510
——— that the episcopate had its commencement in the time of the Apostles, and quotes Jerome as assenting to this, 510, 511
——— mentions four successive Bishops of Alexandria, two of Jerusalem, three of Rome, and two of Antioch, while the Apostle John was yet living, 511
——— that the office of Bishop was approved by the Divine Law, and by CHRIST himself, 512
——— that Timothy was Bishop of Ephesus; Titus of Crete; that Apostles were Bishops of certain cities; that Paul *sat* in Corinth, 512, 504
——— that those who ruled the Presbyters were at first called Apostles, and also Angels, and afterwards Bishops, which took place, Jerome thinks, about the eighth year of Nero, which was several years before the death of Paul, 513
——— that that Apostle who was at Jerusalem, performed the office which the Bishop afterwards did, 501
——— that James was the Bishop of Jerusalem, 501, 511
——— that Timothy was the first Bishop of Ephesus, 504
——— that anciently Bishops alone ordained; a Presbyter being ordained by one Bishop, but a Bishop by two or three Bishops, 504
——— that great advantages redounded to the Church from the episcopate, 514
——— that they who attempt to show that the name of Bishop was common to all Pastors, waste their own and other people's time, 508
——— that those who deny the superiority of one Pastor over the rest, condemn the whole ancient Church of folly, or even of impiety, 509
Grotius, admits that the episcopate was only suspended for a time by the Reformers, and that they considered the office necessary, 518

H

Hilary states that the Apostles are Bishops, 282
——— that the Bishop was the Chief of the Priests; and Presbyters and Deacons subject to him, and that Deacons preached, 282
——— that Paul delivered the apostolical rod to Timothy, 291

I

James appointed first Bishop of Jerusalem, by Peter, James, and John, 326
Jerome states that Bishops were appointed in the time of the Apostles, and by them, 225, 243, 360, 513
——— represents Presbyters as subject to the Bishops, 240, 266
——— does not say that the Presbyters of Alexandria ordained their Bishops, 255, and 256, 528
Ignatius' testimony, 108—123, and App.
——— mentions in his Epistle to the Ephesians their Bishop Onesimus, 115
——— contemporary with both Timothy and Onesimus, Bishops of Ephesus, 118
——— strong testimony respecting the Church of the Trallians, 119
Irenæus' testimony, 128, &c.

K

King, argument of Lord, 378, &c.

M

Melancthon wished the episcopacy restored, 526
Methodist Church not episcopal, having only the ordination of a Presbyter, which the Church fourteen hundred years ago declared null and void, 370, &c. 359—365
Miller, argument of Dr. p. 202, 203
——— alleged cases of ordination of Presbyters, p. 204—210
——— mode of answering arguments of Episcopalians, p. 211, &c.
——— quotations from Ignatius. p. 212—217
——— omission of strong passages, p. 217, and Sections 137, 141
——— objection to Irenæus' testimony respecting the succession of Bishops in the Church of Rome, 208, &c.
Ministers, three orders of, in the apostolic Church, 38 to 41, 554

O

Ordination performed by Bishops alone in the ancient Church, 557
——— never legally by Presbyters, 359—364

Digitized by Google

P

Paul called to be an Apostle, 2, 3
—— established the Church of Ephesus, 4, 5
—— after three years left Ephesus for Jerusalem, 6, 7, 8
—— left Timothy in charge with episcopal authority, 10, 11, 12, 13
—— the time when Paul gave Timothy this charge, 15, &c.
—— journeys of, 16, 80
—— visited Macedonia twice soon after leaving Ephesus, 15—17
—— wrote the first Epistle to Timothy from Macedonia, during last visit, 18—21
—— shortly after went to Miletus, and sent for the Elders of Ephesus before Timothy had taken charge, 25—37
Polycarp's testimony equivalent to Ignatius', 124—127
Presbyters subject to the Bishop. See italic lines in Appendix; also 153, 154, 183, 192, &c. 201, 202, 226, 227, 240, 244, 266, 282, 337 to 352
———— by divine authority, 228—230, 509, 512
———— had not power to ordain, 246, 252, 255—262, 292, &c. 349, 517.
———— permitted by the fourth Council of Carthage late in the fourth century, to lay on hands while the Bishop was ordaining a Presbyter, 517
———— were not permitted so to do in the Western Church generally for several hundred years afterwards, 557 *note*
———— are not now permitted to do so in the Eastern or Greek Church, 557 *note*
———— not permitted to confirm, 247
———— did not sit in primitive times in General Councils, except as representatives of their Bishop, 337
———— many, Bishop always one, in a Church, 341, 342
———— called, with the Deacons, the adherents of the Bishop, 337
———— taken by the Bishops to accompany them to Metropolitan Councils in what number they pleased, 337, 503
———— ordination by, declared null and void in the fourth century, 359—364

S

Successions of Bishops, 130, 185, 208 to 217
———— never broken, 549
———— not in the English branch, 550, &c.
Stillingfleet's concessions renounced, 485
———— asserts that Timothy's case is an uncontrollable case of diocesan episcopacy, 485
———— asserts that there is as great reason to believe the apostolical succession of Divine Institution, as the canon of Scripture, (See 323 to 325.) 485
Schism, attempted justification of, on the ground of the blessings of God attending it, 491 to 493
Summary, 554, &c.

T

Timothy left in charge of the Church of Ephesus when Paul went to Jerusalem and Rome, with episcopal authority, 10, 11, 12, 13, 39
———— took charge, when, 15—21
———— first Epistle of Paul to, written from Macedonia to him at Troas, 21
———— not then at Ephesus, 23
———— called Bishop of Ephesus, 56, 243, 300
———— continued in charge certainly above five years, and longer, but how much longer uncertain, 58—63, 64—91
———— objection of Dr. Miller to episcopal character of, answered, 92, 93
———— had successors of same powers, 94, &c.
———— received the apostolic rod from Paul, 291
Titus an Apostle, 45
—— called Bishop of Crete, 56, 243

W

Wesley, Mr. John, only a Presbyter of the Church, and consequently not authorized to ordain, 370 to 374

ERRATA.

In Section 81, for *Ephesus* read *Macedonia*.
In Section 467, 15th line from the top of p. 174, read *by prophecy* after *thee*.
In Section 548, 4th line, after *stock* read *and the Methodist Church*.
[The preceding list, given in the original edition of the Essay, was not observed until too late for correction. The following is to be added:
In APPENDIX I., p. 392., the first three lines of Section 3, should be *in italics*.]

Digitized by Google

EPISCOPACY

TESTED BY SCRIPTURE.

BY THE

RIGHT REVEREND HENRY U. ONDERDONK, D. D.,

ASSISTANT BISHOP OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA.

"To the law, and to the testimony:"—*Isaiah* viii. 20.

Digitized by Google

The following Essay was first published in the "Protestant Episcopalian" for November and December, 1830. Its re-publication being desired by "the Trustees of the New-York Protestant Episcopal Press," the author has embraced the opportunity to make corrections and improvements, and to append three additional notes—on the permanent obligation of episcopacy—on the plea of 'necessity' for departing from it—and on the objection that monarchy, as much as episcopacy, is set forth in Scripture.

Philadelphia, January, 1831.

Digitized by Google

EPISCOPACY TESTED BY SCRIPTURE.

THE claim of episcopacy to be of divine institution, and therefore obligatory on the Church, rests fundamentally on the one question—has it the authority of Scripture? If it has not, it is not necessarily binding. If it has, the next and only other question is—has any different arrangement of the sacred ministry scriptural authority? If there be any such, that also has divine sanction, and must stand with episcopacy. If, however, none such can be found, then episcopacy *alone* has the countenance of the word of GOD.

Such a statement of the essential point of the episcopal controversy is entirely simple; and this one point should be kept in view in every discussion of the subject; no argument is worth taking into account that has not a palpable bearing on the clear and naked question—the scriptural evidence of episcopacy. It is easy indeed to make a plain topic seem complicated; infidelity casts its flimsy shadow over the doctrine of a GOD; scepticism weaves its webs about the evidence of the senses; Socinianism cannot discern in Scripture proof that the death of CHRIST was a proper atoning sacrifice; and the same cavilling persecution attends almost all simple truths, and that usually in proportion to their obviousness, or the facility of their demonstration. Episcopacy does not escape these inflictions of forensic injustice. Its simple and clear argument is obstructed with many extraneous and irrelevant difficulties, which, instead of aiding the mind in reaching the truth on that great subject, tend only to divert it, and occupy it with questions not affecting the main issue. These obstructions we must remove, and make ourselves a free and unimpeded course, if we desire to go forward with singleness of mind in testing episcopacy by Scripture.

It will therefore be the first object of this essay, to point out some of these extraneous questions and difficulties, and expose either their fallacy or their irrelevancy. The next object will be, to state the scriptural argument.—Little or no reference will here be made to the fathers; not because their testimony is depreciated; for it is of paramount value, in showing how the Scriptures, connected with this controversy, were interpreted by those who knew how the apostles themselves understood them. But the present writer believes that Scripture *alone* will furnish such authority for episcopacy as will convince an unsophisticated judgment, and be held obligatory by an unprejudiced conscience.

Digitized by Google

I. In order to keep the judgment and the conscience thus clear, all *extraneous considerations* must be set aside. To effect this purgation of the argument is our first object.

1. An objection or allegation, entirely extraneous to scriptural reasoning, but often made to bear on the episcopal controversy, is—that our ecclesiastical system is inimical to *free* civil government. We first answer to this objection, that it is irrelevant; for if episcopacy be set forth in Scripture, it is the ordinance of God; of course, free civil governments must, in that case, accede to its unqualified toleration; and the citizens professing Christianity are individually bound to conform to it. No serious person will set any rights of man above the will of God. We next answer, that the allegation is proved to be false by experience. In this country, no firmer friends of civil liberty could or can be found, formerly or at present, than in the Protestant Episcopal Church; nor is there any class of men belonging to that body who are *not* the friends of civil liberty; and in Great Britain the same remark holds true, according to the standard of freedom there deemed constitutional. But we have a third answer—the allegation is false in theory. No free government need fear any reputable denomination, which is not established, and does not intermeddle with political affairs. Should any denomination be tempted thus to intermeddle, the re-action of the spirit of freedom will give it a lesson not to be forgotten in a century. And, as episcopacy is more adverse than non-episcopacy to setting in motion popular currents, or to taking advantage of them, that ecclesiastical system is less likely to fall into such an error. Moreover, when we add to this consideration, that all free governments must desire, from their very nature, to keep popular influence and impulse to themselves, we may securely affirm, that episcopacy is *peculiarly* adapted to free government: not affecting mere popularity, it leaves that field of competition entirely to politicians. Whatever be the reverence and attachment felt towards our bishops, they can seldom, probably never, attain to general notoriety and favour in any branch of civil affairs; none of them have thus far sought any thing of the kind; out of their ecclesiastical sphere, their influence, other than pertains to all virtuous citizens, will ever be but small, or harmless, or exceedingly transient. An *arbitrary* government may indeed find the case different. If the people at large are prostrated by or to the civil power, they may be equally or more subservient to ecclesiastical dominion; in which case, bishops (like all religious leaders) may sometimes prove less tractable than that government desires. But are not such interferences as likely to be favourable to the subject, and his few rights, as against them? And, whether this suggestion be granted or denied, the operation of episcopacy in and on an *arbitrary* government is not the point before us.—We assert that the allegation that episcopacy is, in any sense, unfavourable to *free* civil government, is incorrect, both in theory and in fact, and that the whole objection

Digitized by Google

is irrelevant to the inquiry, whether episcopacy be according to the word of God.

2. Another of these extraneous considerations is—the comparative standing in *piety*, as evinced by the usual tokens of moral and spiritual character, of the members respectively of the episcopal and non-episcopal Churches. This question is highly important in itself; but it has no bearing on the argument for or against episcopacy. We have the authority of our Saviour for the utter moral and spiritual worthlessness of the Scribes and Pharisees of his day: but we have also his authority for declaring that, in spite of their bad character, they "sat in Moses' seat:"[a] and that the people were therefore bound to obey them, while yet they were to avoid following their evil example. Suppose, then, the reader were persuaded that all the bishops in the world were "hypocrites," &c. &c., and that all episcopal Churches were in a corresponding state of degradation, still if Scripture be alleged for the claim that "bishops sit in the apostles' seats," it is but right, in testing *that* particular claim, that there be no reference whatever to the personal character of bishops, or to any real or supposed want of spirituality in the Churches under their government. Our Saviour clearly taught, in the passage alluded to, the entire distinctness of these two questions. Balaam also was a wicked man, but a true prophet.[b] The sons of Eli, bad as they were,[c] ceased not to be priests. The Israelites at large were often corrupt and idolatrous; but they never lost their standing as the earthly and visible Church, till their dispensation was superseded by that of the gospel. Those, therefore, who even maintain that episcopacy is essential to the being of a Church, are not to be worsted by the extraneous argument now before us, the comparative standing in piety of Episcopalians and Non-Episcopalians. And, though the present writer subscribes not to that extreme opinion, his moderation has no affinity with the illogical temperament of mind which allows the question of comparative piety to be obtruded upon the investigation of the simple point—is episcopacy to be found in Scripture?

In justice, however, to Episcopalians, he deems it proper to add, that he does not believe they will suffer by any comparison of their character with those of other denominations.

3. A further suggestion, allied to the one last mentioned, and like it extraneous to the scriptural claim of episcopacy, is—that the *external* arrangements of religion are but of inferior importance, and that therefore all scruple concerning the subject before us may be dispensed with. Now, that there are, in the word of God, things more important, and things less important, is unquestionable; and that the sin of omitting a lesser duty is not so deep as that of omitting a greater, will be allowed. Still, the least sin *is* sin. Perhaps there was no part of the old law

a Matt. xxiii. 2. b Num. xxii. to xxiv. and xxxi. 16. c 1 Sam. ii.

Digitized by Google

that stood lower in the scale of importance than "paying tithes of mint, anise, and cummin;" yet our Saviour declared to the Jews that even this was a duty which they "ought not to leave undone."[d]—Can then episcopacy, though regarded as an affair of the merest outward order, be rated lower than these insignificant tithes? If it cannot, it has a sufficient claim to consideration; high as we deem the obligation to conform to episcopacy, it is enough for the present branch of our argument, that it "ought not to be left" unheeded.

4. An apparently formidable, yet extraneous difficulty, often raised, is—that episcopal claims *unchurch* all non-episcopal denominations. By the present writer this consequence is not allowed. But, granting it to the fullest extent, what bearing has it on the truth of the simple proposition, that episcopacy is of divine ordinance? Such a consequence, as involving the exclusion from the covenant of worthy persons who believe themselves in it, is unquestionably fraught with painful reflections, and that to the serious of both parties: but so are many undeniable truths. Considerations of this kind cannot affect any sound proposition. —Some other considerations, not without value, here present themselves. If Job lived about the time of Moses, or later, he was not in the Church; yet he was eminently pious, and in favour with God: and the same, with some qualification, may be said of his friends. Balaam was not in the Church, yet he was an inspired prophet. Jethro, the father-in-law of Moses, a servant of the true God, of whose sacrificial feast, Moses, Aaron, and the elders of Israel participated,[e] was not in the Church. The descendants of Jethro, who lived with Israel,[f] and must have shared the benefit of the divine oracles, belonged not, we think, to the Church, but were uncircumcised, at least for many centuries: and, under the name of Rechabites, these people thus living with Israel, though not of Israel, and calling themselves "strangers," are highly commended by the Deity, at the very time he passed a severe censure on his Church or covenant people.[g] The countenance given to other proselytes of the gate,[h] is a further illustration to the same effect—*viz.* that, though all who hear the gospel are bound to enter the Church by baptism, yet if any, honest in their error, think they are *not* thus bound, there is Scripture for the assertion, that worthy professors of the true religion, innocently without the covenant-pale, are accepted with God.—Viewing, therefore, the objection before us in even its largest form, it is not of a kind to be driven away from decorous consideration. To say that other denominations of

d Matt. xxiii. 23. Luke xi. 42. e Exod. xviii. 11, 12. f Judges i. 16., iv. 11.

g Jer. xxxv. The question whether the descendants of Jethro were circumcised and belonged to the Church, is discussed, and a negative conclusion drawn, in the *Protestant Episcopalian*, for October, 1830, p. 368. Should, however, any reader incline to a different opinion, he will please regard as omitted so much of the above argument as is involved in that question: it affords only an incidental illustration of the subject, without having the least bearing on our main point.

h See Hammond on Matt. xxiii. 15., and Calmet's *Dictionary*.

Digitized by Google

Christians belong not to the Church, by no means implies that they are cast out from the mercy of God through the Saviour—or, that they are inferior to the Church in moral and spiritual character—or even, that they are not superior in these respects to its members. Still, none of these concessions, supposing even the last of them were made, can render void the divine appointment of the Church, the divine command to "all nations," and of course to all mankind, to be united with it, or the scriptural evidence for episcopacy as the divinely sanctioned organization of its ministry.

Many Episcopalians, however, disclaim the unchurching of those who disallow the episcopal model of the sacred orders. Their reasons for doing so pertain not to the present field of controversy. They think that episcopacy is a sufficiently distinct question, to be separately carried into Scripture, and there separately investigated. They think that its scriptural claims can be sufficiently proved to make its rejection a clear contravention of the word of God, of the intimations there given us concerning his will in this matter. And, if this amount of proof can be offered for the point before us, what serious and conscientious believer will ask for either more evidence, or for its embracing other points, with which the question of episcopacy is not essentially involved?

5. We proceed to other extraneous matter, which, though scarcely plausible even in appearance, is almost uniformly dwelt upon by both parties in this controversy. It is—the adducing of the authority of individuals, who, though eminent both for learning and piety, seem at least to have *contradicted* themselves, or their public standards, on the subject of episcopacy; and who therefore are brought into the fore-ground by either side as may serve its turn. Now, is it not clear, that the only effect of appeals to *such* authorities is to distract sound investigation and the unbiassed search for truth? If the writers in question absolutely contradict themselves or the standards they have assented to, their authority in the case is void; if they seem to do so, their opinions cease to be convincing; they should therefore, *all* of them, be surrendered. The consistency of such individuals is a question for their biographers; it may also belong to the Churches which acknowledge them as leaders; but it certainly is not relevant to the main issue concerning the claims, whether of episcopacy or of parity. A similar rule will apply to all cases of instability or indecision concerning truth. Men of the highest standing for information, for integrity, and in public confidence, are not only fallible, but are often in situations of such perplexity, that they attach themselves to an opinion, or select a course of conduct, without perhaps sufficient inquiry or insight into the case; which opinion or conduct may be at the time, or may afterwards be found, somewhat at variance with their more deliberate judgments. In public life especially, such difficulties are very appalling. The present writer would not

Digitized by Google

regard the mistakes of this sort into which the eminent individuals he now has in mind may have fallen, as blemishes which *men* are called upon to censure, much less to exaggerate or vilify; let it suffice that we do not imitate them; their and our Master, we doubt not, remembers in mercy that we all are but dust.—Most of the principal reformers are to be enumerated under this head of our subject, Luther, Melancthon, Cranmer, Calvin, Beza; we need not extend the list; they have all been somewhat inconsistent on the subject of episcopacy; not much so perhaps to a candid, or at least to a mild judgment; yet enough to impair the *authority* of their individual opinions in regard to the scriptural constitution of the ministry.—Another class of illustrious and good men have been yet more inconsistent; those who, belonging to the Episcopal [English] Church, and acting in the various grades of her ministry, not excepting the highest, were the friends of parity, or at least were not friendly to the episcopacy in or under which they acted. In regard to these also, let it be conceded that even Episcopalians will not criminate them. But let them not be quoted as having *authority* in this controversy, no, not the least; for, however innocent may have been the motive of their inconsistency, that unfortunate quality is too visible to allow their opinions on this subject to have, as such, the least weight in an impartial mind.—A third class may be here added; those who *changed* their deliberate sentiments concerning the claims of episcopacy; among whom Bishop Stillingfleet is conspicuous. Perhaps, in such cases, the later and maturer opinion should be regarded as outweighing the earlier one abjured. But we prefer setting them both aside, as having none of the authority due to the individual decisions of the learned. The *arguments* indeed of all the above classes of persons are worth as much as they ever were, and may be again adduced, if they have not been refuted. And what they placed in their respective public standards, or allowed to be so placed, cannot be retracted, till it be denied as solemnly as it was affirmed. But their individual changes of opinion, or vacillations, or concessions, ought not to be deemed of any force whatever, for or against either party.[1] We reject, therefore, this whole extraneous appendage of the controversy before us. The inquirer after truth has nothing to do with it. Let the admirers of these

---

1 Should it be argued, that, from the inconsistency with which these learned and pious men have expressed themselves on this subject, we may infer their belief in the *non-importance* or *uncertainty* of the point here controverted—I answer, that such a conclusion is not warranted by the premises. If these eminent persons had deemed the question nugatory, they would have said so plainly. Or, if any of them give such intimations, that is a separate question, extraneous to the one now before us, and we have answered it in a previous paragraph, marked 3. These persons, however, generally take sides respecting episcopacy, but do not inflexibly adhere to them. The true inference therefore is, either that they were not entirely consistent, or that they had not full information or full mental discipline in this argument. Take any view of their case, and it will be found that their opinions cannot, as such, have weight in our controversy.

Digitized by Google

eminent individuals endeavour to clear away the slight shades thus resting upon their memories; it is a proper, it is even a pious undertaking; and it may, in some of the cases, have been done sufficiently for personal vindication. But nothing of this kind can make them rank as either authorities or guides in the present controversy.

Appealing to every candid and impartial mind for the soundness of the above rule, we would add—that the rule applies to the *fathers*, as much as to later ornaments of the Church. One, at least, of the fathers has written in a contradictory manner concerning episcopacy. It will indeed be with reluctance that our non-episcopal brethren surrender Jerome, their chief, if not only authority among these ancient Christian writers. But it will be hard to show that he was in no degree inconsistent in his views of episcopacy; it is impossible to show it in such a manner as may, without question, claim to be convincing to both parties.[k] Believing this ourselves, and believing also that it will appear self-evident to most who are duly informed, we appeal to the calm and conscientious decision of the reader, whether the opinions of Jerome must not be set aside, as having no authority in the main issue before us. His *opinions*, we say, for he asserts nothing as a fact, on his personal knowledge; and much of what he does assert is contrary to the testimony of earlier fathers.

6. The last objection we shall notice, as, however plausible, not affecting the ultimate decision of our controversy, is—that though the examples recorded in Scripture should be allowed to favour episcopacy, still that regimen is not there explicitly *commanded*. Now, this allegation may be fully conceded on our part, without endangering the final success of our cause. We say, *may be* conceded; for if episcopacy *be* allowed to be the model exemplified in Scripture, it was of course to that model the apostle alluded when he desired the brethren to "remember, obey, and submit themselves to those who had the rule over them, who had spoken to them the word of God, and who watched for their souls;"[l] which passages, we may justly affirm, were, in that case, an inspired *command* to acknowledge a ministry constituted on the episcopal scheme. Without surrendering this argument, we may, in the present stage of the discussion, proceed without it.

Let then any candid and conscientious believer say, whether a mere *hint* or *intimation* contained in Scripture, (always ex-

---

k Jerome, as quoted in favour of parity, is glaringly inconsistent. On the episcopal side, however, some writers endeavour to reconcile his incongruous opinions. (See Bishop White *on the Catechism*, p. 466; and Dr. Cooke's *Essay*, p. 101. [p. 283, 2d ed.] &c.) But the fact speaks for itself that he is usually adduced on both sides of this controversy. Enough to prove his inconsistency may be found in Potter *on Church Government*, p. 180, Amer. Edit.; in Bishop Hobart's *Apology*, p. 179, &c.; in Bowden's *Letters*; in the *Episcopal Manual*, p. 38; and in the *Protestant Episcopalian*, No. 3. p 90, 97, 98.

l Heb. xiii. 7, 17.

Digitized by Google

cepting what refers to things or circumstances declared to be transient, or such in their nature,) though it have not the force of an express command, is not *sufficiently* binding on every servant of God? St. Paul says of the Gentiles, "these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves;"[m] they had not the positive revealed law, yet the light of nature, which only intimates what we ought to do, but does not specifically prescribe it, was "a law" to them, having sufficient obligation to make its suggestions their duty, and to give those suggestions full authority in "their conscience:" and surely the hints recorded by the Deity in his word are not inferior in obligation to those afforded in his works. Take a few examples. There is no record of a command to observe a sabbath, during the whole antediluvian and patriarchal ages; will it then be alleged that the mere declaration that God "blessed and sanctified the seventh day"[n] did not sufficiently *imply* that it was the divine will that the seventh day should be kept holy? Again: there is no recorded command, in all that early period, to observe the rite of sacrifice, and thus express faith in the great truth, that sin is remitted only by the shedding of blood; shall we then presume—*will* it be presumed, by any whose chief controversy with us is concerning episcopacy—that the records of the example of Abel in the antediluvian age, and of those of Noah, Abraham, &c., afterwards, were not sufficient *intimations* from God that to offer this sacramental atonement was a duty?[o] Yet again: will any humble Christian deny, that the mere fact of the creation for each other of one man and one woman, is sufficient to show that polygamy is contrary to the will of God?[p] To proceed to the New Testament. There is no positive command for infant baptism; but, its analogy with circumcision,[q] the declaration that little children are models for conversion,[r] the direction to suffer them to come to Christ, since of such is the kingdom of God,[s] the records of the baptism of "households," or of families,[t] and the declaration that "children are holy" or saints[u]—are not these sufficient, whether as *examples* or as *intimations*, to satisfy us of the dictate of inspiration in this matter, and to authorize us to regard infant baptism as resting on scriptural authority? And will not the same mode of reasoning be decisive concerning the change of the day of rest and devotion from the seventh to the first?[v]

---

m Rom. ii. 14. n Gen. ii. 3.

o If it be alleged that the "skins" (Gen. iii. 21.) in which the Deity clothed Adam and Eve, were from sacrificed animals, and that the record of that fact is the same as divine appointment and a positive command—we admit the fact, but deny that the inferences are thus identical with it. All that appears in that passage is an *example* of sacrifice. The obligation and permanency of the rite were but presumed from that example, as in the other instances mentioned. This record is but an *intimation* respecting such a duty: yet an intimation of that sort was, we contend, imperative.

p Gen. i. 27. ii. 24. v. 2. Mal. ii. 15. Matt. xix. 4, 5. Mark x. 6.

q Col. ii. 11, 12. Rom. iv. 11, 16. Gal. iii. 7. r Matt. xviii. 3.

s Mark x. 14. Matt. xix. 14. Luke xviii. 16. t Acts xvi. 15, 33. 1 Cor. i. 16

u 1 Cor. vii. 14.

v John xx. 1, 26. Acts ii. 1—4. xx. 7. 1 Cor. xvi. 2. Rev. i. 10.

Digitized by Google

Now, to apply this body of reasoning: Is it claiming too much, if the above illustrations be duly weighed, to assert that the mere *example* of the apostolical Church in regard to the model of the sacred ministry is obligatory, as an intimation of the divine will, without any explicit enactment? And if that example, as deduced from Scripture, be episcopacy, nay, be episcopacy *rather* than parity—if the balance of sound interpretation favour episcopacy ever so little more than any other scheme—will the duty of conforming, if possible, to that ministry be evaded? can such conformity be, in this case, refused *in foro conscientiæ animoque integro?*

The above remarks, if allowed their due force, will greatly simplify the controversy before us, and will help us to investigate the bearing of Scripture upon it, with a clear judgment and an unsophisticated love of truth. Let then all extraneous topics be now forgotten; let none of them again make their appearance in this discussion.

II. Proceeding to the second department of our essay—an exhibition of the *scriptural evidence* relating to this controversy—we begin by stating the precise point at issue. Passing by the feeble claim of lay-ordination and a lay-ministry, which, we suppose, will scarcely pretend to rest on either scriptural command or example, we consider this issue as between two systems only, episcopacy, and parity or the presbyterian ministry.[w] Parity declares that there is but *one order* of men authorized to minister in sacred things, all in this order being of equal grade, and having inherently equal spiritual rights. Episcopacy declares that the Christian ministry was established in *three orders*, called, ever since the apostolic age, Bishops, Presbyters or Elders, and Deacons; of which the highest only has the right to ordain and confirm, that of general supervision in a diocese, and that of the chief administration of spiritual discipline, besides enjoying all the powers of the other grades. The main question being thus concerning the superiority of Bishops, and the rights of the next order being restricted only so much as not to be inconsistent with those of the highest, we need not extend our investigation of Scripture beyond what is requisite for this grand point. If we cannot authenticate the claims of the episcopal office, we will surrender those of our Deacons, and let all power be confined to the one office of Presbyters. But, if we can establish the rights of our highest grade of the ministry, there can be little dispute concerning the degrees of sacred authority assigned by us to the middle and lower grades. This is a further clearing of our argument, not indeed from extraneous or irrelevant matter, but from questions which are comparatively unimportant.

---

w Other denominations besides those called Presbyterians practise presbyterian ordination, as the Congregationalists, Baptists, &c. The ordination also of the Lutherans and Methodists is presbyterian, Luther and Wesley (and Dr. Coke, the source of Methodist orders in this country) having only been Presbyters.

Digitized by Google

The main issue then is—whether Presbyters (or, more strictly, Presbyters *alone*) have a scriptural right to ordain, or whether the agency of a minister of higher grade than Presbyters is not essential to the due performance of that act? Whichever way this great issue be decided, all subordinate questions go with it, if not necessarily, yet because they will no longer be worth contending for, by either party.

As some readers of this essay may not be familiar with the episcopal controversy, it is proper to advert to the fact, that the *name* "Bishop," which now designates the highest grade of the ministry, is not appropriated to that office in Scripture. That name is there given to the middle order, or Presbyters; and all that we read in the New Testament concerning "Bishops,"[x] (including, of course, the words "overseers," and "oversight,"[y] which have the same derivation,) is to be regarded as pertaining to that middle grade. The highest grade is there found in those called "Apostles,"[z] and in some other individuals, as Titus, Timothy,[a] and the "angels" of the seven Churches in Asia Minor, who have no official designation given them; all which positions will be made good in the progress of this essay. It was after the apostolic age, that the name "Bishop" was taken from the second order and appropriated to the first; as we learn from Theodoret, one of the fathers.[b] At first view, this difficulty respecting the names of the sacred orders may appear formidable; but, if we can find the *thing* sought, i. e. an office higher than that of Presbyters or Elders, we need not regard its *name* Irregularity in titles and designations is of so frequent occurrence, yet occasions so little actual confusion, that it ought not to be viewed as a real difficulty in the case before us. Examples to this effect crowd upon us. The original meaning of 'emperor' (*imperator*) was only a general, but it was afterwards appropriated to the monarch; and the original meaning of 'Bishop' was only a Presbyter, but the name passed from that middle grade to the highest. There are, again, the 'president' of the United States, 'presidents' of colleges, and 'presidents' of societies; there are the 'governor' of a commonwealth, 'governors' of hospitals, and the 'governor' of a jail; there are 'ministers' of state, and 'ministers' of religion; there are 'provosts' of colleges, and 'provosts-martial;' there are 'elders' (senators) in a

x Philip i. 1. 1 Tim. iii. 1, 2. Tit. i. 7. In 1 Pet. ii. 25. the word "bishop" is figuratively applied to our Saviour; as "minister" [deacon] is in Rom. xv. 8; and "apostle" in Heb. iii 1. It is worthy of note, that in the last passage, "apostle and *high priest*" are coupled together, as "bishop and shepherd," or *pastor*, are in the first.

y Acts xx. 28. 1 Pet. v. 2.

z That the apostles alone *ordained* will be proved. In 1 Cor. iv. 19—21; v. 3—5. 2 Cor. ii 6; vii. 12; x. 8; xiii. 2, 10; and 1 Tim. i. 20, are recorded inflictions and remissions of *discipline* performed by an Apostle, or threatenings on his part, although there must have been Elders in Corinth, and certainly were in Ephesus.

a Timothy is usually supposed not to have the name "apostle" given to him in Scripture, and our main argument conforms to that supposition.

b See Note A.

Digitized by Google

legislature, 'elders' (aldermen) in a city government, 'elders' (Presbyters) in the Church, and lay 'elders' in some denominations; there were 'consuls' in Rome and in France who were supreme civil magistrates, and there are 'consuls' who are mere commercial agents; there are 'captains' with a certain rank in the army or militia, 'captains' with much higher rank in the navy, and 'captains' with no legal rank; in France, 'monsieur' and 'madame' are (or were) among the highest titles in the court, and are also the common appellation of respect among all ranks of the people. Here, one would say, is an almost unlimited confusion of names or designations; yet this confusion is but apparent; there is no real or practical difficulty in the use of them; custom renders it all easy and clear. So, a little reflection and practice will enable any of our readers to look in Scripture for the several sacred *offices*, independently of the *names* there or elsewhere given them. Let us say, in analogy with some of the above examples, that there are Bishops of parishes and Bishops of dioceses; and when we find in the New Testament the name "Bishop," we must regard it as meaning the Bishop of a parish, or a Presbyter; but the Bishop of a diocese,[c] or the highest grade of the ministry, we must there seek, *not* under that name, and independently of any name at all. We are inquiring for the thing, the fact, an order higher than Presbyters: the name is not worth a line of controversy.

There was at least as much difference between the inferior kings, Herod, Archelaus, and Agrippa, and the supreme king Cesar,[d] as there is between the Presbyter-bishops of Scripture and the Bishops who succeed the Apostles; the mere title "king," common to all these, was far from implying that they were all of one grade.

One irregularity in regard to the application of names is particularly worthy of notice. The word "sabbath" is applied in *Scripture* to only the Jewish day of rest; by very *common use* however it means the Lord's day. Now, "*the* sabbath" is abolished by Christianity, and the observance of it discountenanced;[e] yet ministers of Christian denominations are constantly urging their Christian flocks to keep "the sabbath." Does any confusion of the mind result from this confusion of names? we suppose not. All concerned understand, that *in* Scripture the word means the Jewish sabbath, while *out* of Scripture the same word is commonly applied to the Christian sabbath. Let the same justice be done to the word "Bishop." In Scripture, it means a Presbyter, properly so called. Out of Scripture, according to the usage next to universal of all ages since the sacred canon was closed, it means that sacerdotal order, higher than Presbyters, which is found in Scripture under the title of "Apostle."—

c One having power to govern many churches and clergymen, whether fixed in a diocese or not.

d Matt. ii. 1, 22. Acts xxvi. 2. xvii. 7. John xix. 15.

e Col. ii. 16, 17. Gal. iv. 10.

Digitized by Google

When a Christian teacher who enjoins the observance of the day which he calls "the sabbath" is asked for his New-Testament authority, he has to exclude all the passages which contain that word, giving them a different application, and go to other passages which do *not* contain it; and he argues that he seeks the *thing*, not the *name*. And, when we Episcopalians are asked for inspired authority for "Bishops," we do the very same; we give a different application to the passages which contain that word, and build on other passages, which teach the *fact* of the existence of episcopacy, without that *appellation*. Thus secured by an example which is in high esteem with our opponents generally, may we not hope that they will withhold their censure from this portion of our argument?

Another irregularity of the same kind occurs in regard to the word "Elder." It is sometimes used for a minister or clergyman of any grade, higher, middle, or lower;[f] but it more strictly signifies a Presbyter.[g] Many words have both a loose and a specific meaning. The word "angel" is often applied loosely;[h] but distinctively it means certain created spirits. The word "God" is applied to angels,[i] and idols,[k] and human personages or magistrates;[l] but distinctively it means the Supreme Being. The word "Deacon" means an ordinary servant, a servant of God in secular affairs, and any minister of Christ; but a Christain minister of the lower grade is its specific meaning.[m] So with the word "Elder;" it is sometimes applied to the clergy of any grade or grades; but its appropriate application is to *ministers* of the second or middle order. The above remarks, it is hoped, will enable those who feel an interest in consulting Scripture on the subject before us, to do so without any embarrassment from the apparent confusion of official names or titles.

To this appeal to Scripture in regard to the question between episcopacy and parity, we now proceed.

That the apostles ordained, all agree: that Elders (Presbyters) did, we deny. We open this branch of our argument with the remark, that—Apostles and Elders (distinctively so called) had *not* equal power and rights. And we demonstrate this proposition from Scripture in the following manner.—These two classes of ministers are *distinguished* from each other in the passages which speak of them as "Apostles *and* Elders,"[n] or which enumerate "Apostles *and* Elders *and* brethren," or the laity.[o] If "priests *and* levites," if "Bishops *and* Deacons,"[p] are allowed

---

f Apostles are called 'Elders' in 1 Pet. v. 1. 2 John 1, and 3 John 1. Deacons are certainly included in that designation in 1 Tim. v. 19., and probably in Acts xiv. 23. xxi. 18. and James v. 14. and possibly in Acts xi. 30.

g Acts xv. 6, 23. Tit. i 5. Acts xx. 17. 1 Pet. v. 1.

h Acts xii. 15. Rev i, 20. ix. 14.

i Deut. x. 17. Ps. xcvii. 7. cxxxvi. 2.

k Exod. xx. 3 xxiii. 24, &c.

l Exod. vii. 1. xxii. 28. Ps. lxxxii, 1, 6, cxxxviii. 1. John x. 35.

m See Parkhurst on Διακονος.

n Acts xv. 2, 4, 6, 22; xvi. 4.

o Acts xv. 23.

p Philip i. 1.

Digitized by Google

to be distinct orders, if "Apostles *and* brethren,"[q] are also allowed to be distinct orders, then on the same principle, that the conjunction is not exegetical, "Apostles *and* Elders" may fairly be accounted distinct orders likewise. And as, in the expression "Apostles *and* Elders *and* brethren," severalty is unquestionably implied between the latter of these three classes and the others, it must as clearly be intended between the former two. Apostles were therefore one class, and Elders another class, just as the laity were a third class.—Now, the Apostles were not thus distinguished because they were appointed by CHRIST personally; for some are named "Apostles" in Scripture who were not thus appointed, as Matthias, Barnabas, and probably James the brother of the LORD,[r] all ordained by merely human ordainers; Silvanus also and Timothy are called "Apostles;"[s] and, besides Andronicus and Junia, others could be added to the list.[t] Nor were the Apostles thus distinguished because they had seen our LORD after his resurrection; for "five hundred brethren" saw him.[u] And, though the twelve Apostles were selected as special witnesses of the resurrection, yet others received that appellation who were not thus selected, as Timothy, Silvanus, Andronicus, Junia, &c. Nor were the Apostles thus distinguished because of their power of working miracles; for Stephen and Philip, who were both Deacons, are known to have had this power.[v]—It follows, therefore, or will not at least be questioned, that the Apostles were distinguished from the Elders because they were *superior* to them in ministerial power and rights.[w] And, considering the nature of inherent rights—that they cannot (except in the way of punitive discipline) be taken away or justly suspended, but are always valid—we do not allow that this superiority of the Apostles was but transient, that they kept full power from the Elders for a time, and conceded it to them afterwards. What is given in ordination, is given unreservedly: and, as it is never (except for discipline) retracted, or suspended, or modified

---

q Acts xi. 1.

r Acts i. 26; xiv. 4, 14. Gal. i. 19. Compare the latter with Mark vi. 3, and John vii. 5; and see HAMMOND on St. James' epistle, and Bishop WHITE on the Catechism, p. 431.

s See 1 Thess. ii. 6, compared with i. 1. Paul, Silvanus, (or Silas,) and Timothy, are all included as "Apostles." In verse 18, Paul speaks of himself individually, not probably before. It is not unusual, indeed, for St. Paul to use the plural number of himself only; but the words "*Apostles*" and "our own *souls*" (verse 8,) being inapplicable to the singular use of the plural number, show that the three whose names are at the head of this epistle, are here spoken of jointly. And thus, Silas and Timothy are, with Paul, recognized, in this passage of Scripture, as "Apostles."

t It will here be sufficient to remark, that in 2 Cor. xi. 13, and Rev. ii. 2, "false Apostles" are spoken of. These could not have been, or have pretended to be, any of the eleven, or of the five next above mentioned, or Paul. Their assuming therefore the title of 'Apostles' shows that there were enough *others* who had this title to make their pretended claim to it plausible. And those *others* must have been ordained, not by CHRIST, but by *men* who had his commission.—CALVIN allows Andronicus and Junia (Rom. xvi. 7.) to have been Apostles. *Instit.* b. IV. c. iii. sect. 5.

u 1 Cor. xv. 6. v Acts vi. 8; viii. 6. w See note z, on page 420.

Digitized by Google

by the giver or givers, and particularly, as in the case of the first "Elders" there is no record, and no evidence whatever, of any public decree or private agreement relating to such a retraction, or suspension, or modification, we cannot but regard that theory as mere hypothesis; and against the taking for granted of any mere hypothesis, all sound reasoning protests.—We repeat, therefore, that the "Apostles *and* Elders" were of distinct *orders;* as truly so, as were the "brethren" or laity a third class, different from both the others.

If these views of Scripture and of the nature of inherent rights of office, be allowed, as we think they ought to be, then we have proved in favour of episcopacy, that there was originally a sacred office superior to that of "Elders" or Presbyters. And this is substantiating nearly the whole episcopal claim.

But the defenders of parity reject these our views of Scripture and of official rights, and build their system on the theory which we have pronounced to be mere hypothesis. While they grant the superiority of the Apostles, they contend that the subordination of the Elders was but a transient regulation, required by the exigencies of the then new Church; and that as churches became settled, the whole ministerial power rested in the Elders, no part of it being any longer withheld from them. The proof they allege is, that the "Elders" are said in the New Testament to have ordained and exercised full government and discipline. In answer we assert, 1. that there is *no* scriptural evidence that "Elders" ever obtained or exercised the right [or the complete right] of ordination; but that, 2. there was *continued*, as *had* begun in the Apostles, an order of ministers *superior* to the Elders. Both these assertions we can prove. And under the latter head it will appear that Elders did not exercise discipline over the clergy.

1. There is no scriptural evidence that mere Elders [Presbyters] ordained.

Excluding a few unavailing appeals to Scripture made by some of our opponents, but which we think will be allowed to have the effect of weakening their cause,[x] there are but two passages which can even plausibly be claimed in favour of presbyterian ordination, Yet by neither of these passages can that practice be substantiated.

The first is Acts xiii. 1, 2, 3. Five persons called "prophets and teachers," at Antioch, among whom Barnabas is named first, and Saul last, are directed by the Holy Ghost, "separate me Barnabas and Saul for the *work* whereunto I have called them;" which the other three accordingly did, by fasting and prayer, and the imposition of hands, and then sent them away. This transaction is sometimes presumed to have been the ordination of Barnabas and Saul to the one sacred order of parity; and as it was performed by those who were only "prophets and teach-

x As the facts, that there was more than one ordainer in Acts i. 26. and xiv. 23. The answer is, that the ordainers were Apostles, not mere Presbyters.

Digitized by Google

ers," it is claimed as a scriptural example of presbyterian ordination. But this claim may be unanswerably refuted. 1. Barnabas and Saul are themselves here called "prophets and teachers," and are said to have "ministered to the LORD," as well as the other three; of course, if these three were in orders, the other two were likewise, before this laying on of hands. This transaction, therefore, *if* an ordination, must have been a second and of course higher one; which is inconsistent with parity. If it was not an ordination, as it certainly was not, it was a mere setting apart of those two Apostles to a particular field of duty, which has no bearing on the question before us. 2. Paul had been a preacher long before this occurrence,[y] and Barnabas also;[z] which facts, together with that of their "ministering to the LORD," as already mentioned, are proof positive that they held the sacred commission before this laying on of hands: which of course, we repeat, must have been either a second and higher ordination, which is fatal to parity, or else no ordination, but only a separation to a particular field of duty, to a special "work." 3. That this transaction at Antioch related only to a special missionary "work," will be found sufficiently clear by those who will trace Paul and Barnabas through that work, from Acts xiii. 4. to xiv. 26. where its completion is recorded—"and thence sailed to Antioch, from whence they had been recommended to the grace of GOD for the *work* which they *fulfilled*." This "work," their missionary tour, being "fulfilled," all was fulfilled that had been required by the HOLY GHOST when he had them "separated," or "recommended to the grace of GOD," "for the *work* to which he had called them." This call, therefore, this separation, this work, related only to a particular mission. And *this* laying on of hands was no ordination, but a lesser ceremony, which has no bearing on the controversy between parity and episcopacy. 4. The most explicit proof that this was not an ordination, is found in Gal. i. 1. where Paul declares himself to be "an Apostle, not of men, neither by man, but by JESUS CHRIST and GOD the FATHER." Not *of* men, neither *by* man: is not such language an absolute exclusion of all human agency in Paul's ordination? What other language could add to its strength? None but that which immediately follows: *by* JESUS CHRIST and GOD the FATHER." Paul having been made an Apostle by the Saviour in person, when he appeared to him on the road to Damascus,[a] it could not have been that the transaction at Antioch was his ordination.[b]—And if in his case that ceremony

y Acts ix. 20—22, 27—29. z Acts xi. 23, 26. a Acts xxvi. 16, 17, 18.

b The following additional proofs are worthy of notice. 1. In Rom. i. 5. 1 Cor. i. 17. and 1 Tim. i. 1. Paul asserts that his apostolical commission was from CHRIST. 2. In the first verses respectively of 1 Cor. 2 Cor. Ephes. Col. and 2 Tim. he declares himself an Apostle "through" or "by the will of GOD." 3. In Gal. i. 17. speaking of the period "immediately" after his conversion, he says that he went not to those who "were *Apostles before him*;" of course he regarded himself as an Apostle at that period, and from the moment that CHRIST had appeared to him. 4. In 1 Tim. ii. 7. he asserts his apostleship with a strong asseveration—"where-

Digitized by Google

meant not ordination, it of course meant it not in the case of Barnabas. When the latter had been made an Apostle, we know not; neither do we know when James the brother of the LORD, Silvanus, Timothy, &c. were admitted to that office.

This first claim to Scripture in behalf of presbyterian ordination cannot therefore be substantiated; inasmuch as an act of ordination is not, and cannot be applied to the passage appealed to. Should any think otherwise, they must not only refute the above arguments, but make it appear also from Scripture that the supposed ordainers were mere Presbyters; for the appellations "prophets and teachers" are far from settling this point. If Barnabas and Paul, to whom those titles are given, are to be regarded as laymen about to be ordained, why not regard the other three as laymen also, holding a lay ordination? the one may as well be *taken for granted* as the other; for we read that laymen and even lay-women "prophesied" in the age of inspiration.[c] Or if the three supposed ordainers called "prophets and teachers" were clergymen, they may have been Apostles, superior to Elders, since Silas is called both a "prophet" and an "Apostle"[d] and the prophets are called the "brethren" of the Apostle John;[e] the Apostle Paul calls himself a "teacher."[f] Besides; it has been shown that Paul, here classed with "prophets and teachers," was also at this time an Apostle; and does not this fact afford presumptive argument that the other four whose names stand *above* his in the list contained in the passage, were also of apostolic rank? In view of these many difficulties, we may securely affirm, that it is impossible to bring any evidence whatever that this transaction at Antioch was an ordination by Presbyters. We have, indeed, shown that it was not an ordination of any kind. And we therefore dismiss the claim of non-episcopalians to *this* passage of the New Testament.

Only one other passage is claimed for presbyterian ordination —"neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the *presbytery*." (1 Tim. iv. 14.) This is regarded by our non-episcopal brethren as the record of a presbyterian ordination. Let us inquire, however, whether the transaction *was* an ordination? and whether, if so, it was a *presbyterian* ordination?

Was the laying on of hands on Timothy here mentioned, an

---

unto I am ordained a preacher and an Apostle, (*I speak the truth in* CHRIST *and lie not*,) &c." Had his ordination been performed by men, it would have been well known, as in ordinary cases; had it been performed, as alleged, at Antioch, it would have had peculiar publicity, and such a mode of asserting it would have been out of place and even improper in St. Paul. But his commission having been given him by CHRIST personally, and the men present at the time not understanding the words then pronounced, (Acts xxii. 9.) it was both natural and correct, in declaring that he *was* thus commissioned, to use solemn asseverations and pledge his veracity. This was enough for ordinary purposes. The final proof of his declaration and his asseverations was the performance of miracles.

c 1 Cor. xi. 5. Acts xix. 6. and xxi. 9.

d Acts xv. 32. 1 Thess. ii. 6. comp. with i. 1.

e Rev. xxii. 9.

f 1 Tim. ii. 7. 2 Tim. i. 11.

Digitized by Google

ordination? It cannot, at least, be proved. And, comparing Scripture with Scripture, are we not justified in regarding it as a transaction similar to the one we have just seen in the case of Barnabas and Saul? In both cases there was the ceremony of the imposition of hands. And the dictation of the HOLY GHOST to the "prophets" in the one case, corresponds with the "prophecy," or inspired designation of the individual in the other case; a designation previously adverted to by St. Paul, "this charge I commit unto thee, son Timothy, according to the *prophecies* which went before on thee."[g] We submit this view of the transaction performed by those called the "presbytery" to the candid judgment of our readers. If they should allow that it probably refers to an inspired separation, of one already in the ministry, to a particular field of duty—to the "charge committed to him" in form by St. Paul, corresponding with "the work" to which Saul and Barnabas were separated—a practice which must of course have ceased with the gift of inspiration—they will see that it was *not* an ordination that was performed by the "presbytery," but only a "recommending of Timothy to the grace of GOD for the work he was to fulfil." The ordination of Timothy may be alluded to by St. Paul in the second epistle, "the gift of GOD, which is in thee, by the putting on of my hands."[h] If so, it was an ordination by an Apostle, as is the uniform record elsewhere in the New Testament. If not, then Timothy's ordination is nowhere specifically mentioned, but is to be inferred, as in other cases: and, in this view, both these passages are unconnected with the controversy before us.

But our non-episcopal brethren generally regard the passage in question as referring to the ordination of Timothy. Let us meet them on this ground.

Was it a presbyterian ordination? We first reply, that eminent authority has declared the word "presbytery" to mean the *office* to which Timothy was ordained, not the *persons* who ordained him; so that the passage would read—"with the laying on of hands to confer the *presbyterate*," or presbytership, or the clerical office: in which view, the ordainer of Timothy was St. Paul himself, as mentioned in the clause just quoted from the second epistle. On this point, we adduce a passage from GROTIUS. Speaking of Presbyters laying on their hands near those of a Bishop, he proceeds—"I do not dare to bring in confirmation of this, that expression of Paul's of the *imposition of the hands of the presbytery*, because I see that JEROME, AMBROSE, and other ancients, and CALVIN, certainly the chief of all the moderns, interpret '*presbyterium*' in that place not *an assembly*, but the *office* to which Timothy was promoted: and indeed he who is conversant with the councils and the writings of the fathers, cannot be ignorant that '*presbyterium*,' as '*episcopatus*' and '*diaconatus*' are the names of offices. Add that it appears

g 1 Tim. i. 18. See also M'KNIGHT's note on the passage. h 2 Tim. i. 6.

Digitized by Google

that Paul laid hands on Timothy."[i] By this interpretation of the word "presbytery"—that it means not the ordainers, but the office conferred—we remove all appearance of discrepancy between that passage and the one in which Paul speaks of the imposition of *his* hands. And, to make the least of the above opinion of several fathers, and CALVIN, and GROTIUS, does not their authority render *doubtful* the application of the passage before us to a body of presbyterian ordainers?—Should it be said, however, that the word "presbyterate or presbytership" proves Timothy to have been then ordained a Presbyter merely, we would neutralize that argument by appealing to 1 Thess. ii. 6, (comp. with i. 1.) where he is called an "Apostle." We would also advert to the fact, that however distinct may have been the three above Latin names for the three grades of sacerdotal office, those names of office were, in the Greek, and at an earlier period, applied but loosely. At least, they were so in the New Testament. Thus we read, "this ministry [*deaconship*] and *apostleship*"[k] for the office to which Matthias was admitted: "I am the *apostle* of the Gentiles, I magnify mine office" [my *deaconship*,] "the ministry [*deaconship*] which I have received," "approving ourselves as the ministers [*deacons*] of GOD,"[l] are passages applied by St. Paul to himself; we also read, "who then is Paul, and who is Apollos, but ministers [*deacons*] by whom ye believed;"[m] and "do the work of an *evangelist*, make full proof of thy ministry" [*deaconship*,] "thou shalt be a good minister [*deacon*] of JESUS CHRIST," are admonitions addressed to Timothy,[n] These passages, not to cite here other like ones, while they may be said to go far towards proving that *if* there be only one sacred order, it must be the order of Deacons, answer irrefragably all that might be suggested to the disadvantage of episcopacy from the application of the word "presbytery" to the sacred office to which Timothy was ordained: since, if presbyterate or presbytership means that he was but a Presbyter, deaconship must mean that he, and Matthias, and Paul, and Apollos, were but Deacons. In short, as all experienced interpreters are aware, and as in this controversy Episcopalians always assert, we look not to Scripture for official *names* of any kind, but only for official *powers;* and Timothy, we there find, has a higher degree of power than the word *Presbyterium*, as distinguished from *Episcopatus* and *Diaconatus*, would allow him. The word "presbytery" then, according to the mode of interpretation now before us, though it refer to office, does not designate a subdivision of office, but alludes generally to the *clerical* office conferred on Timothy.

But, granting to our opponents that "the presbytery" means here, not the office given to Timothy, but, as they contend, a body of Elders, and that his ordination is the transaction referred

i See Dr. COOKE's Essay, p. 192. [363, 2d *ed.*]
k Acts i. 25.
l Rom. xi. 13. Acts xx. 24. 2 Cor. vi. 4.
m 1 Cor. iii. 5.
n 2 Tim. iv. 5. 1 Tim. iv. 6.

Digitized by Google

to—we again meet them on the question, was it a presbyterian ordination? And here we ask—of whom was this ordaining "presbytery" composed? for the whole question centres in the meaning of that word. A presbytery means a body of Elders; and taken alone, it can be interpreted of any kind of Elders. Those, for example, who think they find in Scripture what are called ruling-elders, may regard this presbytery as having been made up of them; and, if they were not contradicted by other passages they might here claim a shadow of proof for lay-orders. Others may assert that the grade called Presbyters made up this presbytery. Or, as St. Peter and St. John call themselves "Elders,"[o] this presbytery may have consisted of Apostles. Or, lastly, it may have been composed of any two of the kinds of Elders mentioned, or of all the three kinds uniting in the imposition of hands on Timothy; there may have been ruling-elders and Presbyters, or Presbyters and one or more Apostles, or ruling-elders and one or more Apostles, or ruling-elders and Presbyters and Apostles. There are then no less than seven modes, if we seek no further evidence, in which this "presbytery" *may* have been composed. Or, if we exclude ruling-elders, there are three modes in which it may have been formed; of Presbyters only, of Apostles only, and of one or more Apostles and Presbyters united. The mere expression "presbytery" therefore, does not *explain itself*, and cannot of itself be adduced in favour of parity.

If, however, it be urged, that the *specific* meaning of the word "Elder" should have the preference, so as to place Presbyters only in this ordaining "presbytery," we answer—that the *specific* meaning of the title of an *individual* officer is far from extending necessarily to the similar title of a *body* or an *office*. We have just noticed an objection kindred with this; but it may not be improper to add some further illustrations of the uncertainty of official names. Thus we say, the Jewish "priesthood," including in that term, with the priests, the superior order of high-priests, and the inferior one of levites. Thus also we have the phrases, "ministry [literally *deaconship*] of reconciliation," and the expressions "that the ministry [*deaconship*] be not blamed," "seeing we have this ministry" [*deaconship*,] "putting me into the ministry" [*deaconship;*] and more especially "Apostles, prophets, evangelists," &c. are *all* said to have been given "for the work of the ministry" [*deaconship;*][p] in all which passages the word deaconship, διακονια, the appellation strictly of a sacred body of men, or of their office, includes, nay signifies chiefly, those who were superior to Deacons. The word "presbytery" therefore, being no more definite than "ministry or deaconship," cannot *explain itself* in favour of our opponents. It can only be defined "a body of clergymen."[q]

o 1 Pet. v. 1. 2 John 1. 3 John 1.

p 2 Cor. v. 18. vi. 3. iv. 1. 1 Tim. i. 12. Ephes. iv. 11, 12.

q The word "presbyterate or presbytership" also means, as just shown, nothing

Digitized by Google

And these clergymen may have been in part or entirely Apostles, who were superior to Presbyters.

It is evident, therefore, we repeat, that this passage, *if* it refer to an ordination, cannot be interpreted without light from other Scriptures. To this light, therefore, we refer.

The "presbytery," we have seen, may have consisted of Apostles only, or of one or more Apostles joined with others. In conformity with this suggestion, we find St. Paul writing to Timothy, "that thou stir up the gift of God, which is in thee by the putting on of *my* hands."[r] Now, the same reasons which make the passage respecting the laying on of the hands of the *presbytery* apply to ordination—the same reasons will make this other passage, respecting the putting on of *Paul's* hands, apply to that identical ceremony; unless indeed a second and higher ordination be here supposed, which however destroys parity, and which of course parity cannot adduce in its own behalf. In the ordination, therefore, of Timothy, Paul had at least a share; that *Apostle* laid on his hands, whoever else belonged to the ordaining "presbytery." It cannot of course be claimed as a presbyterian, but was an apostolic ordination. And thus the allegations of our opponents from this passage, in support of the ordaining powers of mere "Elders," are overturned. We have proved that Presbyters alone did *not* perform the ordination, granting the transaction to have been one, but that an Apostle actually belonged, or else was added for this purpose, to the body called a "presbytery."[s]

It is worthy also of note, that St. Paul makes the following distinction in regard to his own agency and that of the others in this supposed ordination—"*by* the putting on of my hands"—"*with* the laying on of the hands of the presbytery." Such a distinction may justly be regarded as intimating that the *virtue* of the ordaining act flowed from Paul; while the presbytery, or the rest of that body if he were included in it, expressed only *consent*.

On the whole: Can it be denied, that a cautious and candid interpretation of the two passages said to relate to the ordination of Timothy, requires that a minister be present who holds the [ordinary and uninspired portion of the] rank and rights of an Apostle, to give ordaining power to any body called a presbytery? Were there even no explicit evidence in our favour in the other parts of Scripture, the episcopal theory would be at least as good a key as that of parity to the meaning of the word

more specific than "the *clerical* office." The word "bishopric" (Acts i. 20.) has, on the same principles, no stricter signification. The present writer is not aware of any instance in Scripture in which the *specific* meaning of a name of office has necessarily the preference; perhaps the word "apostleship" is an exception; it is used only of those known to have been Apostles.

r 2 Tim. i. 6.

s Ignatius, well known for his zeal for episcopacy, and martyred about the year 110, calls the *Apostles* the "presbytery of the Church." *Epist. to the Philadelphians*, Sect. 5. [p. 396 of this volume.]

Digitized by Google

"presbytery." And considering the above distinction of "by" and "with," our theory is obviously the better of the two. Yet here the non-episcopal argument from Scripture is exhausted. Its strongest proof has been demonstrated to be but barely consistent with parity, while it is more consistent with episcopacy. We dismiss therefore the claim of our opponents to this, the only passage of Scripture, besides the one before dismissed, to which they could raise any pretensions.

Let our readers now be reminded, that we before showed "Apostles *and* Elders" to have been distinct classes of ministers, as distinct as were the "brethren" or laity from both. That the former ordained, is allowed on all hands, and is clear from Scripture.[t] But we have now demonstrated that there is no inspired authority for the claim that mere Elders [Presbyters] ordained—none, at any period of the apostolic age. Of course, there is no scriptural proof that such Elders have the *right* to ordain. To adduce evidence of their enjoying such a right, was incumbent on parity; but having failed to do so, it cannot ask of us to allow such a right without evidence. It cannot be proved, and it is not to be allowed without proof, that mere Presbyters either performed the ordinations mentioned in Scripture, or are there said to have the right to perform such acts. This position cannot be overturned.

2. All that is now incumbent on episcopacy is—to show that the above distinction between Elders and a grade superior to them, in regard especially to the power of ordaining, was so persevered in as to indicate that it was a *permanent* arrangement, and not designed to be but temporary To this final branch of our argument, which is also an independent and very prominent argument for episcopacy, we now proceed.

Let any one read Acts xx. 28 to 35, and consider well what St. Paul there gives as a charge to the *Elders* (Presbyters or Presbyter-bishops) of Ephesus. Then let him read the two epistles to Timothy, and reflect candidly on the charge which the same Apostle gives to him personally, *Timothy* at Ephesus. And, after this comparison of the charges, let him decide whether Scripture does not set that one individual *above* those Elders, in ecclesiastical rights, and particularly in regard to the power of ordaining.—Or, if such an inquirer feel any doubt as to the positiveness with which the superiority of Timothy is asserted, let him conscientiously determine what are the *intimations* of Scripture on this subject—which way the balance of proof inclines. To us the proof seems absolute; but it is enough for a rightly disposed mind that it only preponderate. Examine then, these two portions of the New Testament; and first, that relating to the Elders.

In Acts xx. 28, &c. the Elders of Ephesus are charged—to take heed to themselves—to take heed to all the flock over which

t Acts i. 26. vi. 6. xiv. 23. 2 Tim. i. 6.

Digitized by Google

the HOLY GHOST had made them overseers—to feed the Church of GOD—and, remembering the Apostle's warnings for three years, to watch against the grievous wolves that would assail the flock, and against those from among themselves who would speak perverse things. These are the four points (or three, if the second and third be united) of the admonition left with them by St. Paul; to which another may be added, from verse 35, concerning industry, and charity to the "weak." Now, what is there in this admonition or charge which shows that these Elders had the power of clerical dicipline? surely nothing. They are to be cautious themselves, and to watch against false teachers; but no power is intimated to depose from office either one of their own number, or an unsound minister coming among them. They are to "feed," or perhaps (as the word is sometimes translated) rule[u] the Church; i. e. they are to "tend it as shepherds."[v] The "Church" of course means here the "flock" before mentioned, or the laity;[w] for shepherds do *not* tend or rule shepherds, unless it be that there are *superior* shepherds among them, who have received such authority from their common master or employer. Government of the clergy, therefore, these Elders had not, as far as appears, within their own body. And not a trace or hint is there of their having had the right to ordain.

We may here add, that the right of these Elders to govern and ordain cannot be claimed as resulting from construction or implication; for every passage in Scripture which asserts or intimates power over the clergy, gives that power to Apostles, or else to Timothy and Titus, or to the "angels" of the seven Churches in Asia; and these cannot be proved to have been mere Presbyters, but were, as we have shown in regard to the Apostles, and are now showing in regard to the rest, distinct and superior officers. Constructive or implied powers can only be inferred in the absence of positive evidence; and as there *is* positive evidence in other passages, nothing of implication can be valid here. The positive evidence is against parity; nor can construction be resorted to for its relief.—Nor is a resort to such construction suggested by the *spirit* of Paul's address to these Elders, since the theory which asks no construction is quite as congenial with its several expressions as that which requires it. On the episcopal theory, indeed, there can be no final authority over the clergy without a Bishop; but it is not contrary to that theory, that Presbyters, in such a case, exercise much spiritual discipline over the laity: they may repel from the communion, which is a very high act of "ruling;" and, there being no Bishop, there can be no appeal from such a sentence. Among us, a diocese without a Bishop "rules the flock" in many respects,

u See Note B.

v See PARKHURST on ποιμαινω.

w As in Acts xv. 4, 22. It is simply possible that Deacons are included in such passages.

Digitized by Google

but has no final or executive authority over its clergy; and Ephesus was without a Bishop when Paul addressed the Elders, Timothy not having been placed over that Church till sometime afterwards.[x] As therefore the episcopal theory suits this address perfectly, without a resort to constructive or implied powers, such a resort in behalf of the Elders is unnecessary, is gratuitous, and, of course, is an unsound mode of interpretation.

The functions then of the Elders of Ephesus, as developed in Acts xx. were only pastoral; they were to feed, tend, rule, the *flock*, and take heed to them, and, watching for them, were to warn them against false teachers. As St. Paul elsewhere expresses the duty of Bishops, (Presbyter-bishops,) they are to "take care of the Church of God;"[y] the "Church" meaning of course the laity, as just observed in regard to Acts xx. 28. Or, as St. Peter expresses that duty, they are to "take the oversight" of the "*flock*" which they "feed."[z] These, we believe, are *all* the rights named in Scripture as belonging to Elders. Whatever higher privileges are there specified or adverted to (except the bare possibility of their having been united with Paul in the "presbytery" which is supposed to have ordained Timothy) are invariably ascribed to Apostles, or to the other persons before mentioned, as Timothy, Titus, and the "angels" of the seven Churches.

Compare now with this sum total of power assigned in Scripture to mere Elders or Presbyters, that of *Timothy* at Ephesus, the very city and region in which those addressed by Paul in Acts xx. resided and ministered. Look through the two epistles addressed to that individual by the great Apostle, and mark the *explicit* manner in which the right of governing the clergy and of ordaining is ascribed to him personally—every part of both epistles being addressed to him in the singular number—"this charge I commit unto *thee*, son Timothy"—"these things write I unto *thee*, that *thou* mightest know how to behave *thyself* in the house of God"—"if *thou* put the brethren in remembrance of these things."[a] Observe the same address to him in the singular number when clerical government and discipline are spoken of—"that *thou* mightest charge some that they teach no other (no false) doctrine"—"against an Elder receive not [*thou*] an accusation, but before two or three witnesses"—"them [those of the Elders thus accused] that sin, rebuke [*thou*] before all, that others also may fear"—"I charge *thee* . . . . that *thou* observe these things [these rules of clerical discipline, &c.] without preferring one before another, doing nothing by partiality."[b] Observe particularly *his* right to ordain—the qualifications of Bishops (Presbyter-bishops) and Deacons are ad-

---

x The date of the placing of Timothy at Ephesus is discussed in M'KNIGHT *on the Epistles*, Vol. IV. p. 156; and in the *Church Register* for 1827, Nos. 13 to 17.

y 1 Tim. iii. 5.

z 1 Pet. v. 2.

a 1 Tim. i. 18; iii. 14, 15; iv. 6.

b 1 Tim. i. 3; v. 19, 20, 21.

Digitized by Google

dressed to him, "these things write I unto *thee*"[c]—he is afterwards admonished, in regard to the ordaining of these two inferior orders, "lay [*thou*] hands suddenly on no man"—and again, "the things which thou hast heard of me, the same commit *thou* to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also,"[d] i. e. to men who are both sound in the faith and apt to teach. Observe, moreover, that, while to the Elders of Ephesus Paul alludes to ministers who would "speak *perverse things*,"[e] yet gives not a hint of *their* exercising discipline upon such offenders, to Timothy he mentions that very error, and in terms entirely equivalent, as having occurred at Ephesus, calling it the "teaching of other or *false doctrine*," and desires *him* to check it—"that *thou* mightest charge some that they teach no other doctrine"—and it is afterwards added, respecting the clergy who thus or otherwise were in fault, "them that sin, rebuke *thou*."[f] Teaching "other doctrine" and speaking "perverse things" are one and the same offence; the correction of it is no where committed to the Elders; to Timothy it is here expressly committed.

Is it not evident, abundantly evident, that Timothy had supreme power over the clergy at Ephesus, and the full right to ordain? Comparing these many passages, and the tenor and spirit of the entire epistles, with the before cited address to the Elders of Ephesus, can any one require stronger proof of episcopacy, or stronger disproof of parity? Did not the ministry at Ephesus consist of three orders—Timothy first, the Elders (or Presbyter-bishops) next, and Deacons last?—it clearly did.

Compare again that address, and all that is recorded of mere Elders, with the epistle to Titus. Examine *his* powers in the island of Crete. To *him* are specified the due qualifications of a Presbyter-bishop or Elder.[g] His clear credential from the Apostle Paul is, "for this cause left I thee in Crete, that *thou* shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and [that *thou* shouldest] ordain Elders in every city, as I had appointed *thee*"—and again, "a man that is an heretic, after the first and second admonition, [do *thou*] reject:"[h] ordination, admonition, and rejection, (or degradation and excommunication,) are all committed to Titus personally. The Elders, as already seen, had no power given them to "reject" those who should "speak perverse things" or "heresy;" Titus *had* that power.[i] All this agrees perfectly with the case of Timothy. And nothing like it can be shown, any where in Scripture, of any who are there distinctively called Elders or Presbyters. Is it not clear, then, that the recorded powers of Titus make him an officer of a grade superior to that which we must assign, resting only on the sacred record, to such Elders? This is episcopacy.

---

c 1 Tim. iii. 1—14. d 1 Tim. v. 22. 2 Tim. ii. 2. e Acts xx. 30.
f 1 Tim. i. 3; v. 20. g Tit. i. 6—9 h Tit. i. 5; iii. 10.
i The expression "*perverse things*," the teachers of which the Elders had no power to condemn, agrees with that used respecting the heretic, "such is *subverted*," whom Titus had power to reject. The words are, διεστραμμενα and εξεστραπται.

Digitized by Google

Compare, yet again, all that is recorded of Elders, with the epistles to the "angels" of the seven Churches of Asia.[k] Each of those Churches is addressed, not through its clergy at large, but through its "angel" or chief officer; this alone is a very strong argument against parity and in favour of episcopacy. One of those Churches was Ephesus; and when we read concerning its angel, "*thou* hast tried them which say they are Apostles, and are not, and hast found them liars,"[l] do we require further evidence that what Timothy, the chief officer there, was in the year 65, in regard to the supreme right of discipline over the clergy, the same was its chief officer when this book was written, in the year 96? Let us examine also other passages. In each of these small epistles, the "angel" is made responsible individually for the errors of the respective Churches, and is commended individually for their respective merits; and this, although there must have been several or many Elders in each of those Churches, as there were in Ephesus thirty or forty years before.[m] Observe the emphatic use of the singular number in the address to each of the angels—"I know *thy* works,"[n] is the clear and strong language directed to them all successively, implying the responsibility, not of a Church at large, or of its clergy at large, but of the head or governor individually. To the same effect we read, as commendations of these angels—"*thou* holdest fast my name"—"*thou* hast a few names which have not defiled their garments"—"I have set before *thee* an open door"—"*thou* hast a little strength, and hast kept my word"[o]—and, on the other hand, they are thus rebuked—"I have a few things against *thee*"—"because *thou* hast them that hold the doctrine of Balaam"—"*thou* sufferest that woman Jezebel . . . to teach, &c."—"if *thou* shalt not watch, I will come on *thee* as a thief"—"*thou* art neither hot nor cold."[p] Similar to these are the warnings of CHRIST to these "angels," all implying their individual responsibility for the faults of the Churches,—"remember [*thou*] from whence *thou* art fallen, and repent [*thou*] and do [*thou*] the first works"—"repent [*thou*] or else I will come unto *thee* quickly"—"be [*thou*] watchful, and strengthen [*thou*] the things which remain"—"hold [*thou*] fast that which *thou* hast"—"be [*thou*] zealous, and repent [*thou*]."[q] There are other like passages; indeed these seven epistles are nearly made up of them. The individual called "the angel" is, in each case, identified with his Church, and his Church with him. And in the few places where the language addressed to the Churches by the Saviour is in the plural number,[r] it is addressed to them generally, no particular reference being made to their Elders, as if they shared the responsibility.[s] On the contrary, we find this

k Rev. ii. iii.
l Rev. ii. 2.
m Acts xx. 17.
n Rev. ii. 2, 9, 13, 19; iii. 1, 8, 15.
o Rev. ii. 13; iii. 4, 8.
p Rev. ii. 14, 20; iii. 2, 15.
q Rev. ii. 5, 16; iii. 2, 11, 19.
r Rev. ii. 10, 23—25.
s See Note C.

Digitized by Google

peculiarly strong expression in the admonition to the angel of the Ephesian Church, where, as has been fully shown, there were many Elders or Presbyters, "I will remove *thy* candlestick [*thy Church*] out of his place, except thou repent"[t]—not the Church of the presbytery, nor even of thy presbytery, but "*thy* Church." Surely a diocesan is here!

Test then by these seven epistles, by each of them and all of them, the episcopal and presbyterian theories, and see which best agrees with their letter and their spirit: most assuredly they are episcopacy from beginning to end. Connect these epistles with those to Timothy and Titus; and decide whether they do not all proclaim episcopacy. Compare this entire connected evidence with all that is recorded concerning the powers of mere Elders; and let the spirit of candour and impartiality determine whether episcopacy does not even triumph in the abundance of its scriptural proofs.[u]

And let it be observed, that we have made no use of those scriptures which merely *agree* with episcopacy, or tend to *illustrate* the affairs of the apostolic Church according to that theory, but only of those which are its *demonstration*. And this, we think, is complete.

All minds, however, do not appreciate evidence equally. Let then our argument be rated at its lowest value, and it will still be sufficient. Is there any thing like positive proof in Scripture, that mere Elders [or Presbyter-bishops] had the power of supreme discipline over the clergy, or ordained without the co-operation of a minister of higher authority? there certainly is not, as we have fully shown. Is there not, however, in Scripture, proof absolutely positive that persons of higher authority than Elders did ordain, and did possess the supreme right of clerical discipline? there certainly is, as we have most abundantly demonstrated. Is there not, moreover, positive scriptural proof that these high powers, superior to those ascribed to mere Elders, existed in other individuals than the original Apostles, and continued in the possession of such officers to the latest date of the inspired volume? it cannot be reasonably questioned. Now, let the reader estimate all this evidence as low as he pleases, it is evidence *enough* for episcopacy. A *hint* concerning the will of God should be imperative with every humble and conscientious believer. The slightest preponderance of proof, when all has been investigated, should be sufficient for a candid mind.—Let then such considerations have their due weight with those who may think that our argument comes short of demonstration.

We are persuaded, however, that to strict and severe reasoners it will appear a very close approximation to demonstrative proof.

---

t Rev. ii. 5. In Rev. i. 20, the candlesticks are said to be the Churches.

u For further remarks on the *permanent* obligation of episcopacy, see Note D. And concerning the plea of *necessity* for departing from that ministry, see Note E.

Digitized by Google

Of such reasoners we ask—can a single step be made in applying Scripture to the support of parity, without *taking something for granted?*[v] if there be an argument for parity free from this objection, the present writer does not recollect to have seen it. On the other hand, is not the scriptural argument for episcopacy *a regular induction from scriptural facts?* we are persuaded that no impartial mind will answer in the negative.

We assert, therefore, in conclusion, that the episcopal ministry alone has the authority of the inspired writers. All the facts, all the examples they record, without one clear exception, show that such was the ministry of the apostolic age. We therefore now add this other assertion—that such was the ministry alluded to by the Apostle when he wrote, "remember them which have the rule over you, who have spoken unto you the word of God, ... obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves, for they watch for your souls, as they that must give account."[w] Whether such an injunction, taken in connexion with what has been proved in this essay, does not amount to an inspired *command* to conform to the episcopal ministry, is left, with prayer for their right direction and decision, to the consciences respectively of our readers.

POSTSCRIPT.

On the plea of Parity—that Timothy acted as an "Evangelist."

Parity alleges that Timothy exercised supreme authority in the Church at Ephesus as an "Evangelist;"[a] and that that office, like (on their theory) the entire apostolic supremacy, was but temporary; and that thus, in a short period, the whole clerical power rested in the one grade of Elders or Presbyters.

To this allegation, in all its parts, we have several conclusive answers.— 1. Timothy is called an "Apostle"[b] as well as an "evangelist;" and as he thus had the highest ecclesiastical power in virtue of the apostolic office, the appellation "evangelist" could add nothing to it. Neither, of course, can any inference bearing on the episcopal controversy be drawn from that appellation.— 2. It does not appear that evangelists had, as such, any particular rank in the ministry. Philip, the Deacon, was an "evangelist;"[c] in Ephes. iv. 11. "evangelists are put after "prophets;" in 1 Cor. xii. 28. they are not included at all; it

v See Note F.

w Heb. xiii. 7, 17. See also Note G. for a refutation of the objection, that monarchy has as good scriptural authority as episcopacy.

a See 2 Tim. iv. 5. b 1 Thess. ii. 6., compared with i. 1. c Acts xxi. 8.

Digitized by Google

appears also that some of the laity did the work of evangelizing;[d] and yet Timothy, an Apostle, is directed, we see, to do the same work. To rely therefore on the mere *title* "evangelist" in proof of any thing which is to affect our controversy, is futile; no argument can be built upon it without *taking for granted* that evangelists had, as such, these high clerical powers, which is the very allegation in dispute.—3. There is *no proof whatever* that Titus and the "angels" of the seven Churches were evangelists. If, therefore, we should surrender the case of Timothy, these other cases of supreme ecclesiastical authority would still contradict parity, and be evidence for episcopacy. Sound reasoning, however, will rather yield up the claims founded on the application to Timothy of the mere title "evangelist;" it would rather retain the case of Timothy for the episcopal cause, independently of other considerations, from its perfect analogy with these cases, which obviously and unavoidably belong to that cause.—4. If we should allow that the superior rights of the Apostles and of this evangelist came soon to a close, there would yet be no evidence (or no clear evidence) that mere Elders either had or acquired the power of ordaining and of executive clerical discipline. We should but find that the Church was left *without* an order of men who could show positive inspired credentials for exercising these high functions. And this *demonstratio ex absurdo* is of itself almost sufficient for episcopacy. The superior office of the Apostles, and of Timothy, Titus, and the seven "angels," *must* have been intended to be permanent, whatever was the name of that office, and however its name might be changed. For, be it not forgotten, that, as it cannot be proved, it ought not to be allowed, that any but those who held this apostolical or episcopal office, superior to that of mere Presbyters, either performed the ordinations mentioned in Scripture, or are there said to have the right to perform such acts.

No certain and precise definition can be found for the word "evangelist," as used in Scripture; the mere name decides nothing more than it would in the more thoroughly English form *gospeller*. Etymologically, its only meaning is "a person occupied with or devoted to the gospel;" and as the gospel means the "good message," the idea contained in the latter word may be extended to "evangelist," and that title be defined "a messenger of the good message," *i. e.* one who proclaims the gospel. Applied in this sense to a minister, it seems equivalent to the word preacher; it may also mean, but not

d Acts viii. 4. and xi. 19, 20.; see the Greek. In Acts viii. 1. the "church" at Jerusalem is said to be scattered abroad; the Apostles are excepted; with that exception "they were *all* scattered," saith the passage; meaning, doubtless, that so many fled as to break up their assemblies; of course, the scattering applies to the laity chiefly; and some of these are thus, we think, included among those who were engaged in "evangelizing." The word "preach" in these passages is of course, in this view, used by our translators with some latitude; as will also be seen on examining the Greek—λαλεω and ευαγγελιζω being the words thus translated.

Digitized by Google

necessarily, a spreader of the gospel, a missionary; and missionaries, we know, may be either Bishops, Presbyters, or Deacons, either of the three orders. Yet in none of the three places in Scripture where the word "evangelist" occurs[e] are missionary duties even hinted at. The epistles to Timothy require of him nothing of the kind; and the immediate context of the verse containing that word charges him only to "preach the word, to be instant in season, out of season, to reprove, rebuke, exhort to sound doctrine, watch, and endure afflictions." It is not to be presumed then from Scripture that an evangelist was necessarily a missionary.[f] Nor was the Church at Ephesus new enough to require Timothy as its evangelist in the missionary sense; for it must have been eleven years founded when Timothy is, for the first and only time, called by that title.—Etymology and Scripture then, the only proper authorities in our present argument, both leave the meaning of the word "evangelist" uncertain.

And if we consent to appeal to the fathers, to which our opponents would lead us for further light concerning "evangelists," we shall not only gain, from their abundant general testimony in favour of episcopacy, infinitely more than we could possibly lose by having this word defined by them against us, but we shall actually have their authority respecting that word in our favour. A commonly received definition, founded on an imperfect extract from one of the fathers, EUSEBIUS, is merely this—an evangelist was appointed "to lay the foundations of the faith in barbarous nations, to constitute them pastors, and having committed to them the cultivating of those new plantations, to pass on to other countries and nations."[g] All this is indeed perfectly consistent with the episcopal theory, since such an evangelist may be a missionary-bishop. A fuller examination however of EUSEBIUS will show that evangelists did not merely found new churches, but builded also those founded by others—and that the evangelists he speaks of in the place quoted, are declared by him to have been ordained to the highest grade of the ministry, before they set out on their work. We extract the whole chapter, except a few concluding lines which are irrelevant, from an old translation.

"Chap. xxxiii. *Of the Evangelists then flourishing.* Among them which were then famous was Quadratus, whom they say (together with the daughters of Philip) to have been endued with the gift of prophesying. And many others, also, at the same time flourished, which, *obtaining the first step*[h] *of apostolical succession*, and being as divine disciples of the chief and principal men, *builded* the churches every where planted by the Apostles: and preaching and sowing the celestial seed of the kingdom of heaven throughout the world, filled the barns of

e Acts xxi. 8. Ephes. iv. 11. 2 Tim. iv. 5.

f See note H.

g See DR. MILLER'S Letters, p 94. [p. 61, 2d ed.]

h In the Greek τάξιν, order, rank, station, appointment.

Digitized by Google

God with increase. For the greater part of the disciples then living, affected with great zeal towards the word of God, first fulfilling the heavenly commandment, distributed their substance unto the poor: next, taking their journey, fulfilled the work and office of *Evangelists*, that is, they preached Christ unto them which as yet heard not of the doctrine of faith, and published earnestly the doctrine of the holy gospel. These men having planted the faith in sundry new and strange places, *ordained* there other pastors, committing unto them the tillage of the new ground, and the oversight of such as were lately converted unto the faith, passing themselves unto other people and countries, being holpen thereunto by the grace of God which wrought with them; for as yet by the power of the Holy Ghost they wrought miraculously, so that an innumerable multitude of men embraced the religion of the Almighty God at the first hearing, with prompt and willing minds. Insomuch that it is impossible to rehearse by name, when and who were pastors and *Evangelists* in the first *succession after the Apostles* in the Churches scattered throughout the world; it shall seem sufficient only to commit to writing and memory, the names of such as are recorded unto us by tradition from the Apostles themselves, as of *Ignatius* in the epistles before alleged, and of *Clemens*, mentioned in the epistle which for undoubted he wrote unto the Corinthians, in the person of the Roman Church," &c.[i]

On this extract several remarks may be made.—1, Eusebius here describes what took place long before his own time, and what therefore he knew but imperfectly.[k]—2, Evangelists, he says, did the stationary work of "building" the churches, as well as the migratory one of "founding" them; which shows that the definition of that title, in regard to the question whether it necessarily implied missionary functions, is not to be certainly made out from the fathers any more than from Scripture: for what difference is there between a stationary Evangelist and a settled minister?—3, The Evangelists spoken of by Eusebius are said to have "obtained the first step [rank] of apostolical succession," *i. e.* were made Bishops, in the sense of that word in the days of Eusebius, and ever since; which shows that it is a mistake to quote his account of Evangelists in favour of parity; those alluded to by him were Evangelist-bishops.—4, Those Evangelists who are *named* by him in this extract, were all proper Bishops. Quadratus was Bishop of Athens. Ignatius was Bishop of Antioch. Clement was Bishop of Rome. All which is recorded in this same work of Eusebius.[l]—5, Lest it be thought that his expression, "the greater part of the disciples then living" became Evangelists, makes it absurd to suppose them all Bishops, let it be remarked that he speaks of the rich

i Eusebius *Eccles. Hist.* Lib. III. ch. xxxiii. being ch. xxxvii. after the Greek.
k See the end of Lib. VII. and the beginning of Lib. VIII.
l Lib. III. ch. xix. xxxi. xxxii. Lib. IV. ch. xxii.

Digitized by Google

only among the disciples, since of none but these would he probably have recorded that they "distributed their substance to the poor." Yet even with this restricted interpretation, and much more when unrestricted, this expression of Eusebius is magniloquent and oratorical, and not fit to be the basis of any argument concerning the number of the early Evangelists.—6, Ecclesiastical historians sometimes speak of a person's ordaining, who did not perform the rite himself, but had it done by another; as the historian Socrates says of the emperor Constantine, "when he had builded churches among them, he hastened to consecrate them a Bishop, and to ordain the holy company of clergymen."[m] If it be thus said that Constantine consecrated and ordained, though he only employed Bishops to do so, it is competent for us to infer, that the same must be meant, if Eusebius be understood to say, that Evangelists, not of the highest ministerial rank, ordained; they only *caused* persons to be ordained by ministers of that rank. The fair construction, however, of his language, is—that the Evangelists he speaks of were themselves of that highest order.—7, Eusebius was a thorough Episcopalian, in the sense of the word "Bishop," in that and the present day: he speaks of ordaining by Apostles and Bishops,[n] and is full of the "successions" of various lines of Bishops down from the Apostles.[o] If, then, he was consistent with his own opinions, he cannot mean that Evangelists of inferior rank ordained, but must be so interpreted as not to violate his own principles. If, however, he be inconsistent with himself, when he comes to speak of Evangelists, his authority on that subject is, of course, nugatory. But, we repeat, he is *not* inconsistent with himself, if construed candidly, *i. e.* according to his own principles of episcopacy, in regard to those Evangelists of whom, in the passage above quoted, he writes. They were Bishops.

The other persons *named* by Eusebius, in his history, as Evangelists, excepting of course the four writers of the gospels, are, we believe, only two. One, named Thaddeus, was sent by the Apostle Thomas into Edessa, where he performed miracles, preached, and ordained: but he is himself called an "Apostle" many times in this work;[p] which decides that he also was in the highest order of the ministry. The name of the other was Pantænus, who was at first a teacher of divinity at Alexandria, in Egypt. The following is recorded of him: "He is said to

---

m SOCRATES *Eccles. Hist.* Lib. I. ch. xiv. being chap. xviii. after the Greek. The same transaction is mentioned in EUSEBIUS' *Life of Constantine*, Lib. III. ch. lvi. "their city, (Heliopolis,) which was blinded with superstition, was become the Church of GOD, and filled with Priests and Deacons, and they had a Bishop to govern them."

n EUSEB. *Hist.* Lib. VI ch. vii. xlii. Lib. II. ch. i. Lib. III. ch. xx. Lib. IV. ch. xiv.

o *Ibid.* Lib. III. ch. iv—xi—xix—xxxii. Lib. IV. ch. v—xix. Lib. V. ch. xi. Lib. VI. ch. ix. Lib. VII. ch. xxxi. Lib. VIII. ch. i. &c. &c.

p Lib. II. ch. i. Lib. I. ch. xiv.; see particularly what there follows an epistle said to have been written by our Saviour.

Digitized by Google

have showed such a willing mind towards the publishing of the doctrine of CHRIST, that he became a preacher of the Gospel unto the eastern Gentiles, and was sent as far as India. For there were, I say, there were then many *Evangelists*, prepared for this purpose, to promote and to plant the heavenly word with godly zeal, *after the guise*[q] *of the Apostles*. Of these Pantænus, being one, is said to have come into India."[r] On this extract, which we believe completes the evidence on the subject before us, contained in Eusebius, these two remarks suggest themselves. 1. It is not said that this Evangelist, Pantænus, ordained; he may, like the emperor Constantine, have procured ordination by others for the clergy set over the churches he founded. 2. Taking for granted even that he did ordain, we read that he "planted the heavenly word *after the guise of the Apostles*," conforming to their model or standard; of course his ordinations were after the apostolical example, which has been fully shown in the above essay, and was certainly believed by Eusebius, to have been according to the episcopal scheme. Such ordinations he could not have performed without being a proper Bishop himself.

We think then that parity gains nothing by going to Eusebius for an account of the office and powers of Evangelists. On the contrary, the gain, such as it is, is on the side of episcopacy.

After what has now been said, no impartial person will, we think, contend that Eusebius meant to say that *all* Evangelists (of all grades) had the power of ordaining. If, however, such a proposition be maintained concerning this father, we neutralize the evidence thus *claimed*, by counter-evidence of the same kind, that of an ancient but uninspired author, who, in conformity with Scripture, asserts that there were among the Evangelists, persons who had *no* right to ordain. We quote from HAMMOND:[s]—"For, as the office of Evangelist, being to preach to unbelievers, requires not the donation of all the episcopal powers, *viz.* of ruling, nor the power of ordination necessarily, because when the Evangelist hath planted the faith, the Apostle himself may come and confirm, and ordain Bishops, as we see in Samaria, Acts viii. 17. (and therefore the author of the *Commentaries on the Epistles* under St. AMBROSE's name, saith on this place, *Quamvis non sint sacerdotes, evangelizare tamen possunt sine cathedra, quemadmodum Stephanus et Philippus*, though they be not priests, [that is, Bishops,] yet they may evangelize without a chair:) so the donation of that superior power doth not yet make them cease to be Evangelists." Stephen and Philip, both Deacons, and having no right to ordain, or to occupy the episcopal "chair," are yet, we see, reckoned Evangelists by this writer. Stephen, who we know died a Deacon, is called by him an Evangelist. And Philip, who when called in Scripture an

q μιμηματος, conformity to a model, example, or standard; copy; close imitation.
r Lib. V. ch. ix. being ch. x. in the Greek.
s On Ephes. iv 11. Note B.

Digitized by Google

Evangelist, is also denominated "one of the *seven*" *Deacons*, is said by this writer to have been, equally with Stephen, "without a chair" of sacerdotal office. This then is uninspired proof, to be added to that of revelation, that Evangelists had not, merely as such, the right to ordain. And taking into view the whole of this sort of proof, the definition which we quoted above from an eminent Presbyterian divine, will, we think, be allowed to be, in this respect, too unqualified.

This appeal to the fathers has been made only to meet our opponents on their own ground, in their attempt to define from those writings a word, the meaning of which cannot be clearly made out from Scripture. We have shown that what the fathers add towards its elucidation, is entirely in our favour.

Returning to Scripture, we conclude with yet another answer to the assertion of parity—that the superior powers of Timothy, being founded on his being an "Evangelist," were to be exercised only during the early and unsettled state of the Church at Ephesus. And here we shall take the case according to parity's own showing. Most Presbyterian controvertists (as also, indeed, many other writers) suppose Timothy to have been placed at Ephesus so early as at the sudden departure of Paul for Macedonia after the riot there.[t] His duty, as an Evangelist, was (say anti-episcopalians) to settle the affairs of the then new Church in that place. If so, be it remembered, he soon performed one part of what (they say) was required of him as such an extraordinary officer; he soon ordained Elders in that city or region which (they say) was before destitute of them; for its Elders are addressed by Paul in less than a year after his flight from Ephesus.[u] These Elders, be it next remarked, are there declared (they say) to have power to "rule" the flock and their own body, besides that of ordaining. If so, the government of that Church was fully organized: and thus was fulfilled the other part of the function of Timothy, as a special and extraordinary officer. Of course that extraordinary officer, the Evangelist, was no longer required; the Ephesian Church had obtained a body of Elders, competent, if any such body is, and at least said by parity to be competent, to ordain and "rule." Nay, Paul, it is alleged, had *charged* these Elders to "rule the Church of God." It surely was time for Timothy, if a mere Evangelist, to "pass on to other countries and nations."

Now, how does this obvious *cessation* of their need of the supposed extraordinary officer, agree with the undeniable fact that the *second* epistle was written to him almost seven years after the supposed date of his being placed in Ephesus, and more than six years after the interview of Paul with its Elders—this same Timothy still exercising his ecclesiastical powers in that city? In the *second* epistle, and that only—eleven years after the first preaching of Paul in Ephesus,[v] more than nine years

t Acts xix. 23, &c.: xx. 1. 1 Tim. i. 3. u Acts xx. 17. v Acts xviii. 19.

Digitized by Google

after the establishment of a Christian body there distinct from the Jews,[w] nearly seven years after the supposed commission to Timothy to settle their affairs, and more than six years after Paul addressed their Elders—in that late *second* epistle, and that only, is Timothy called an "Evangelist," and desired to "do the work" of such a functionary. That is (says parity) Timothy was still required for the purpose of ordaining,[x] although there had so long been Elders there competent to ordain! Timothy (says parity) was still required for the governing of that body of clergy, although that body had had, for so considerable a period, an intrinsic ecclesiastical power to "rule" its own members!

Is it not obvious then, that the two hypotheses of parity, that concerning the right of mere Presbyters to ordain and govern, and that concerning the rights of Evangelists, are inconsistent with each other? The Evangelist Timothy (they are forced to say) held restrained till at least the year 66, the power to "rule," which Paul had charged the Elders to exercise in the year 60! Or else, they must say that the Evangelist Timothy *supplanted*, in the year 66, the rights of the Elders who had been planted in Ephesus by the same Evangelist Timothy, in the year 59 or 60! May we not ask, when did he, or any other apostolical man, plant those rights again? Does not the scriptural evidence on these points *leave* the supposed rights of Presbyters either withheld or taken from them, without a hint that the restriction or deprivation was afterwards removed? And may we not justly declare, that such incongruities in the best theory of our opponents—for they certainly have none better, or as good—are something very like an absolute disproof of parity, and, of course, as strong indirect proof of EPISCOPACY?

---

w Acts xix. 9.

x In the second epistle to Timothy, as well as in the first, allusion is made to his ordaining power; see 2 Tim. ii. 2: and in another place, after urging him to "do the work of an Evangelist," the Apostle adds, "make full proof [fulfil all the parts] of the ministry," which of course included ordaining. 2 Tim. iv. 5.

Digitized by Google

APPENDIX.

NOTE A—PAGE 420.

Refer to POTTER *on Church Government*, p. 175. Amer. edit. and to the *Protestant Episcopalian*, No. 3. p. 94.

VIDELIUS, a non-episcopal writer, says of Clemens Romanus, mentioned in Phil. iv. 3. that after the death of Linus and Cletus, who were Bishops of Rome before him, "*Clemens solus Episcopi nomen retinuit quia jam invaluerat distinctio Episcopi et Presbyteri*—Clement alone retained the name of Bishop, because there had now grown into use the distinction between Bishop and Presbyter." Our quotation is taken from the answer of Charles I. to the divines who argued with him in the Isle of Wight, p. 11; and it shows that a learned non-episcopalian allowed the use of the title Bishop, as having been surrendered by a portion of those clergy who had formerly enjoyed it, and made superior to that of Presbyter, to have been common in the age just after the apostolic, and before the death of St. John;* and this is equivalent to the assertion of Episcopalians, that that title was very early taken from the second order of the ministry, and appropriated to the highest, which had previously been called Apostles.

NOTE B—PAGE 432 & 442.

Our argument allows the word "feed" to be changed to "rule;" but this is mere concession. The venerable translators have given the true meaning of ποιμαινω *as adapted to the passage*: the context usually deciding the choice between the several meanings of a word. In Matt. ii. 6. the word "governor," and in Rev. ii. 27. xii. 5. and xix. 15, the phrase "rod [sceptre] of iron," point to the *ruling* power of a shepherd. But in the present passage "flock" is the proper defining word in the context; and "feed" is its correlative. If it be alleged that "overseers" is the defining word, we answer, that, as a literal shepherd is never called in Scripture an "overseer" επισκοπος, the defining function belongs more appropriately to the word "flock," as required by the congruity of figurative language: we further answer, that the meaning of "overseers," allowing it to be the defining word for ποιμαινω, comes short of the idea of proper "ruling" or supreme government, and agrees better with that of "feeding" or tending a flock. The word "tend" would be a sound translation.—Let those who contend for the word "rule" in this place, consider what effect it might have on our controversy with Rome to allow the same word in John xxi. 16, where JESUS says to Peter "feed [rule] my sheep." If ποιμαινω may be translated "rule" without authority from the context, it may be so rendered in the latter passage. If, however, this arbitrary mode of translation be disallowed, *rule* cannot be what Paul meant in addressing the Elders of Ephesus.

CAMPBELL translates John xxi. 16. "*tend* my sheep," and has an excellent note. BEZA has *pasce* "feed," both there and (*pascendam*) in Acts xx. 28. CALVIN and ERASMUS give *pasce* "feed" in the former, but use the strong

* Clement succeeded as Bishop of Rome, A. D. 91; St. John died A. D. 100. See CALMET's *Dictionary*.

Digitized by Google

word *regendam* "govern," in the latter; which was either a great oversight or a great inconsistency.

Observe especially this further consideration. When the Romanists urge that, in *their* sense, Peter was to "rule" CHRIST's sheep, we answer, that this notion is fully disproved by other Scriptures; as, Paul's withstanding Peter to the face, and James' presiding in a council held at Jerusalem, though Peter was present. (Gal. ii. 11. Acts xv. 13, 19.) And when the advocates of parity assert, that, in *their* sense, the Elders "ruled" at Ephesus, we give them an answer precisely analogous; other Scriptures contradict that notion, as is especially seen in both the epistles to Timothy, as also in those to Titus and the "angels" of the seven Churches. The word "feed" therefore (or "tend") is clearly the proper one in both passages: neither the Pope nor Presbyters have a right to the *rule* which they respectively claim.

NOTE C—PAGE 435.

In the epistles to the "angels" of the Churches in Smyrna and Thyatira, (Rev. ii.) there is a change from the singular to the plural number. This we Episcopalians say, marks a transition of the address, from the angel or Bishop, to his Church generally; but parity often alleges that these examples of the plural number show the entire epistles to have been intended for each whole Church; and thus, it is supposed, the idea is refuted that these seven epistles were meant for the angels or Bishops, distinctively and individually. But the same change in the mode of address occurs in the epistle of Ignatius to Polycarp, Bishop of the same Church at Smyrna; as will be seen by a reference to Archbishop WAKE's *Translation of the Apostolical Fathers*, p. 228, American edit.; or Dr. COOKE's *Essay*, p. xxiii.* In the first four paragraphs, Ignatius addresses Polycarp personally and exclusively. In the fifth he sends a *message*, through Polycarp, to the "sisters" and the "brethren." But in the sixth he bursts forth *directly* to the Church of Smyrna, the flock at large—"Hearken unto the Bishop, that GOD also may hearken unto you. My soul be security for them that submit to their Bishop, with their Presbyters and Deacons. And may my portion be together with theirs in GOD. Labour with one another, contend together, run together.....Let none of you be found a deserter.....Be long-suffering therefore toward each other in meekness, as GOD is towards you." The paragraphs following are addressed to Polycarp, like the first four. Now, no one doubts that this epistle was directed to one individual, Polycarp, and that the greater part of it related to him personally, or in the sacred office which he held; those even who deny its authenticity must allow that it is fabricated on this principle: yet the whole of the people are, in the very body of the epistle, addressed directly by Ignatius. Such an episode then is no violence to the main current of such a writing; it was not, in that age, deemed absurd or incongruous. An address to the flock does not vitiate the address to their Bishop in which it occurs. This answers the only real objection to the episcopal construction of the epistles to the seven "angels."

It may be here added, that, in the second epistle of St. John, the address is twice changed from the plural number to the singular; part of it being addressed to the "elect lady" particularly, and part to her and her children jointly.

The inscription and the conclusion of the epistle to Philemon are addressed to several persons and a Church; the body of the epistle is addressed to Philemon, and intended for him exclusively.

In Philip. iv. 2, 3. are direct addresses to individuals, occurring within the body of an epistle to a whole Church.

* See page 401, second edition.

Digitized by Google

NOTE D—PAGE 436.

Episcopacy Permanent.

Scriptural proof having been given for episcopacy, down to the latest date of the inspired canon, and it having been also shown that no other ministry is set forth in the New-Testament, all is done that was proposed in the beginning of this essay. It will not, however, be improper to add a few more remarks concerning its *permanent* obligation. Some allege that, though as the only scriptural model it was binding in the first ages, it does not follow that it continues binding through the whole Christian dispensation. To this allegation we thus reply:—1. It resembles that of the denomination of Friends concerning the sacraments, that their outward signs were intended for only the early Christians, not for our later periods. There is no stronger intimation, we believe, that visible sacraments were to be perpetual, than that the ministry established by the Apostles was to be so: the expression, concerning the LORD'S Supper, "ye do show the LORD'S death *till he come*," being no stronger than the charge to Timothy (and every succeeding minister of his rank) to "keep the commandment" or trust committed to him "*till the appearing of our* LORD JESUS CHRIST." (1 Cor. xi. 26. 1 Tim. vi. 14.) The answer to this error concerning the sacraments is or includes an answer to the supposition before us, that episcopacy, though having inspired authority at first, was yet of only transient obligation. This answer to the mistaken opinion concerning the sacraments we need not here detail, as those we now address unite with us in deeming it sufficient.—2. If it be allowed, of any two ministries now existing, that the one is based on Scripture, and the other not, no sound mind, we think, will deny that the former is obligatory to the exclusion of the latter.—3. When our Saviour, after finally commissioning his Apostles, added "lo, I am with you alway, even to the end of the world," (Matt. xxviii. 20.) he meant that He would always be with the apostolic ministry. This is affirmed by sound Presbyterians, as well as by ourselves. And the declaration proves that *that* ministry was to exercise its LORD'S authority in the Church to the end of the world. That ministry, the apostolic or scriptural one, we have demonstrated, and is allowed by the persons with whom we now argue, to have been episcopal. Can it then be imagined by those who are thus far with us, that any ministry subsequently established has the Saviour's authority? If not, then the position cannot be evaded, that episcopacy is permanently binding, "even to the end of the world."—4. The epistles to Timothy are said by parity to be intended for all ministers in all ages. Episcopalians say that, besides being addressed to him as the *chief minister* at Ephesus, they were intended for the direction of all other chief ministers, by us called Bishops; and this, we presume, is allowed by those for whom this note is written. We now make the more explicit statement, that these epistles are for the direction of Bishops *in all ages*. This assertion is proved by the injunction, before quoted, to fulfil their trust "till the appearing of JESUS CHRIST;" and particularly by there being passages in them which speak of "the latter times" and "the last days." (1 Tim. iv. 2 Tim. iii.) These periods, as distinguished by the evils that were to attend them, did not, we think, begin during the life of Timothy; for what the Apostle writes concerning them is in the future tense, "in the last days, perilous times *shall come*," &c. And it has been well remarked, that, though the vices there mentioned have always existed in the world, their being spoken of as *characteristic* of the latter days implies, that besides being common, they would be openly avowed and defended; which cannot be said of the primitive Church. But begin "the last days" and their mischiefs when they might, they have not ended yet; neither, of course, is the obli-

Digitized by Google

gation respecting them, imposed on Bishops by these epistles, ended; nor is the consequent obligation of Christians ended, to support bishops in these their duties, *i. e.* to conform to episcopacy; non-conformity being opposition, either active or passive. And thus episcopacy had and has authority through all these periods; its authority is permanent, down to the present age of the world. One direction, grounded on latter-day defections, is particularly worthy of notice; "from such turn [thou] away," or as otherwise translated, "such turn [thou] away." (2 Tim. iii. 5. See M'Knight.) In the former sense, the passage recognises an *authoritative* discountenance or rejection of false teachers, or of false flocks with their teachers, to be exercised by an individual church officer "in the last days." In the latter sense, it recognizes, more explicitly, the power of *excommunicating* such persons, as residing in such an individual officer, in these periods. In either sense, episcopacy is recognized, as existing and having authority "in the last days"—in other words, as a permanent institution, and of permanent obligation.

NOTE E.—PAGE 436.

The Plea of Necessity.

It is due to our discussion, to add a few remarks on the question—whether *necessity* will justify a departure from the apostolical or scriptural ministry, or the instituting of a new ministry where that cannot be obtained? On this subject, the first point to be determined is, what *is* 'necessity'?—'Absolute necessity' to assume the functions of the ministry never can exist; salvation is not indissolubly connected with the offices of a pastor; the sacraments are not absolutely, but only "generally necessary to salvation," those who cannot obtain them not being required to partake them.—Difficulties long insuperable, preventing the attainment of an important object, form the next species of 'necessity,' and that which is usually referred to in this argument. And here several questions arise—are the difficulties *insuperable*—have they been *long* insuperable—is the object so *important* as to justify deviation from an institution allowed to be *divine?* There should be no reasonable doubt on either of these points.

In our opinion, the last of the above questions can never be justly answered in the affirmative; *no* plea can be strong enough to release us from *divine* appointments. What God has instituted for his Church he will preserve in his Church, and diffuse though it, till the institution be abrogated by him, or is about to be so. This appears to us so clear a dictate of faith, so fundamental a religious truth, that we will not argue for it; it is an axiom, or at least an undeniable postulate. And it ought to settle the whole matter. But we shall carry the discussion through.

As then to the other two questions—we doubt whether the difficulty of obtaining an apostolic ministry, has ever been *insuperable* for any greater period than might naturally and fairly be allowed for the purpose—and we deny that the difficulties, be they what they might, have ever been *long* insuperable. And thus far, having used only the phrase apostolical or scriptural ministry, we suppose that Parity agrees with us.

We now remind our readers that we have, in our essay, proved the apostolical ministry to be episcopacy. And, to come at once to the great case, we think it doubtful whether Luther and his associates, and Calvin and his associates, were prevented from obtaining episcopacy by difficulties strictly *insuperable.* It is well known to those acquainted with ecclesiastical history, that Novatian, a schismatic Bishop, induced three obscure Bishops to consecrate him:* and among the multitude of papal Bishops, could not

* MILNER, Vol. I. p. 351. and EUSEBIUS, Book 6.

Digitized by Google

those Reformers have found three, elevated or obscure, to give them the succession, or else to join with them, and preside over their purified Church? and this, without resorting to the culpable methods ascribed to Novatian? if this was not clearly impracticable; our present argument has all that it asks. Again: it is known to the readers of church history, that Frumentius, after collecting together a few Christians in India (perhaps Abyssinia,) and converting some of the natives, applied to Athanasius, Bishop of Alexandria in Egypt, for a Bishop to govern them, and ordain pastors for them:* and could not the Reformers alluded to, failing with Romish Bishops, have gone or sent, to the Greek, or other Eastern churches, for the episcopal succession? did they ever make the experiment? Yet again: it is recorded, that the Bohemian Church obtained episcopacy from the Waldenses:† and could not the Reformers above mentioned have obtained it from either the Waldenses or the Bohemian fraternity? did they attempt to do so, although these Christian communities were as much opposed to the Pope as themselves? In fine: Did either of those Reformers use any efforts whatever for this purpose? if not, how can the difficulty be called insuperable? or how can it be made the basis of the plea of necessity? Now, be it recollected we question not the motives of these eminent servants of God; we believe them to have been pure; but, on that point, they and we stand or fall only to our common master; motives have nothing to do with the claims of truth. All that we assert is, that be the difficulties what they might in procuring episcopacy, it is doubtful whether they were insuperable; and that if they were not insuperable, the case of 'necessity' did not exist. We may indeed carry this part of our argument yet further, and ask, whether *any* difficulty of magnitude can be alleged—if we may draw, from the following quotations from Milner, the conclusion, that Bishops so friendly to Luther would have consecrated him? ". . . . John Thurzo, Bishop of Breslaw in Silesia. This good prelate was descended from a noble family in Hungary, and is said to have been the very first papal Bishop who, in his diocese, was favourable to the revival of pure Christianity. . . . . Luther, on the occasion of his decease, says in a letter to a friend, 'in this faith died John Thurzo, Bishop of Breslaw, of all the Bishops of this age the very best.'" "The pious Thurzo died in August, 1520; but the reformation does not appear to have materially suffered from this loss. His successor, James of Saltza, trode in his steps. This Bishop appointed . . . . John Hesse . . . . . a dear friend of Luther, to preach the gospel in the church of St. M. Magdalen at Breslaw. Hesse not only explained and enforced the great truths of Christianity from the pulpit, but for eight days together, in a public disputation, defended the same, and exposed the papal dogmas concerning the mass and the celibacy of the clergy"‡—to the joy of Luther, and the vexation of the Pope. Bishops thus friendly to Luther and his cause, and thus appointing to a conspicuous station one of his dear and zealous friends—could they not have been prevailed on to consecrate him? They were, of course, under the usual promises of fidelity to the Romish Church; but these could have been no stronger in their particular cases, no more binding, than those of all the first Reformers, whether Bishops or Presbyters; who all held such obligations to be dissolved, when they came to perceive that the vital corruptions inflexibly maintained by that Church required their separation from it. We therefore suggest the doubt, whether there was *any* difficulty of magnitude in the way of Luther's obtaining episcopacy for his Church.

* SOCRATES, B. I. c. xix. and MILNER, Vol. II. p. 110.

† Commenius, quoted in BOWDEN'S *Letters*, Vol. II. p. 79. Vol. III. 332, 342. Vol. I. p. 223. II. p. 163, 2*d ed.*]

‡ MILNER, Vol. V. p. 259, 260.

Digitized by Google

The above considerations render almost unnecessary a notice of our remaining proposition—that insuperable difficulties did not *long* exist. We proceed however to the proof. Luther separated from the Church of Rome in 1520; the *protest* on which the name Protestant was founded, was made in 1529; the Confession of Augsburgh dates 1530.* Now, to say nothing of the possibility of getting the episcopal succession in England under Henry VIII, who died in 1547, or under Edward VI, the Church in Sweden was fully reformed in 1527, and that in Denmark in 1539;† both were reformed under Lutheran influence; and both retained episcopacy. Will then any considerate person deny, that, had efforts been made, the succession might have been obtained from Sweden not "long" after Luther abjured the papal authority, and before the period when the name Protestant and the Augsburgh Confession gave the finish to the Lutheran Church? Or, if that Church had obtained episcopacy ten years afterwards, when Denmark could have given it to them, would *that* have been waiting "long" for a divine institution? Where then is the evidence on which the plea of 'necessity' is grounded!—Let the reader be reminded, that we are not discussing, in this note, the claims of the ministry which those great reformers established; that is done in our essay. Neither are we arguing here with those who deny episcopacy to be a scriptural institution; *they* have no occasion for the plea of 'necessity.' Neither do we now touch the question, whether this point of external order is of importance; on that subject, our essay has, we presume, said enough; and those who plead 'necessity' allow, by so doing, the importance of the rule departed from on that account. The present note is intended for those who grant the apostolic origin of episcopacy, and its obligation, except in the one case of 'necessity,' reasonably defined. And to *these* we say, that there is no evidence that such 'necessity,' concerning the point before us, has ever existed.

On the subject of '*supposed* necessity' (supposed by the persons originally concerned) it is impossible to argue, because the case cannot be defined; one person calling that 'necessity' which another denies to be so. When the difficulty appears great, those who yield to it are, we doubt not, excused by a merciful God; and they ought to be fully and readily excused by men. But this mild judgment of *persons* does not establish either the correctness of their *opinions*, or the validity of their *acts*.

Least of all, can the 'supposed necessity' which may formerly have led to a deviation from divine institutions, be a sound plea for *persevering* in that deviation after the 'supposed necessity' has ceased. It has now been shown, we think, that there never was any real 'necessity' for dispensing with episcopacy. But, allowing for former periods all that is ever claimed on that score, there has been no difficulty at all in procuring a protestant episcopate, or else in finding one to conform to and unite with, since the Scotch Bishops consecrated Bishop Seabury, the first on our American list.

NOTE F—PAGE 437.

The great *petitio principii* of our opponents is, that the whole apostolic function, as distinguished from that of Presbyters, was transient. For this supposition, there is neither proof nor hint in Scripture. Inspiration was transient; but in no other respect can the apostleship be shown to have lost its original completeness. Timothy, Andronicus, and Junia, are called Apostles; but there is no evidence that they were inspired; and though Silvanus, also denominated an Apostle, was a "prophet" (Acts xv. 32.) it

* Mosheim, Vol. IV. p. 50, 71, 89. † *Ibid.*, Vol. V. p. 79, 82.

Digitized by Google

will be allowed, we presume, that this does not imply that he possessed the higher inspiration of the more eminent apostolic fraternity.

Of the sophism here censured, there are many lesser exemplifications in the argument of Parity, as may be seen in the following statement.

Parity never can prove, but always *takes for granted* one or more of the following points—1. that because the name "Bishop" is applied, in Scripture, to the second order of the ministry, there is no higher order there mentioned—2. that the transaction in Acts xiii. was the ordination of Barnabas and Saul—3. that the word "presbytery" means, not an office, but a body of Elders, and—4. of Elders strictly, without an Apostle, or—5. if an Apostle was with them, that he had no more ordaining power than they—6. that evangelists had, as such, supreme power over new churches and their clergy—7. that no individuals but the proper Apostles had such authority over churches and their clergy after their affairs were settled—8. that the epistles to Timothy were meant for all the clergy in Ephesus—9. that Timothy had supreme authority in Ephesus only as an evangelist, not as an Apostle, or as such a successor of the Apostles as was afterwards called a Bishop—10. that Titus was an evangelist—11. that each of the seven Churches of Asia consisted of but one congregation—12. that the "angels" were but pastors of single congregations—13. that they were but moderators of bodies of Presbyters, &c. &c. Some of these points are always *taken for granted*, in the anti-episcopal argument intended to rest on the basis of Scripture. We deny them all, and aver that that Scripture furnishes *no* evidence, less or greater, direct or indirect, towards substantiating them.

NOTE G—PAGE 437.

On the objection—that monarchy, as much as episcopacy, is set forth in Scripture.

It has been alleged, that as clear authority is found in Scripture for monarchical government and its perpetuity, as for episcopacy and its perpetuity, "submit yourselves to ——— the king as supreme," (1 Pet. ii. 13.) being as strong a precept as "submit yourselves to them that watch for your souls," which we have applied to the episcopal ministry set forth in the New Testament. This allegation, however, is easily refuted.—1. Where it is said that the king or Roman emperor was supreme, it is also declared that this was the ordinance of *man;* and it is because it was "the *ordinance* of man" that submission to the emperor was enjoined. The office was "the creation (κτισει) of man." Of course, man may change that office for another, and thus substitute a republican for a royal or imperial government. But the Christian ministry is the appointment or creation of God; so, at least, parity believes as well as we; and with parity is our controversy, not with the feeble claim of lay orders, or the creation of ministers by mere human authority. To suppose the ordinance of man, because recognized and enjoined in Scripture, to be as perpetually binding as the ordinance of God, there recognized and enjoined, and not retracted, is, we think, absurd.—2. Should it be further objected that "the powers that be" are declared to be "ordained of God;" (Rom. xiii. 1.) we answer, that nothing is here mentioned of kings but only of "the higher powers," and that, unlike some of the provincial people, the Romans, to whom that language was addressed, abhorred the title of king;* which circumstances show, independently of other considerations, that it is not to be taken for granted that mere monarchical "powers" were meant in this passage. But besides this: It *could not* have been meant

* See POOLE'S *Synopsis* on 1 Pet. ii. 13. and M'KNIGHT on do.

Digitized by Google

that the then existing Roman authorities were ordained of God for perpetuity; for both prophecy (Dan. vii. 26. 2 Thess. ii. 7.) and history attest the contrary; which prophecy is *scriptural* proof against that interpretion. Neither were the then existing "powers" *beyond* the Roman empire ordained to be perpetual. They were all, therefore, ordained of God in only this lower sense—to serve the purpose of civil government while they should respectively last. In our opinon, "the powers that *be*" means 'the established civil authorities that *at any time* exist;' submission to these is made binding on Christians by the Christian law; just revolutions, as incidental to every ordinance or creation of man, being exceptions to this rule. The object of such passages is, we think, to consecrate the social principle which leads to civil magistracy, and affix the seal of the divine Author of Christianity to the maxim, that men are *not individually* sovereign, but either *jointly* so, or else subject to some other *common* sovereignty; and that maxim, thus divinely ratified, decides that men must submit to the lawful public authority under which they live. But this has no bearing on the case of the ministry, which was not only created and ordained of God, but concerning the abolition or change of which no prophecy or hint is uttered, which all history attests to have been perpetuated in the episcopal form, and which, if it ever fail, must be again appointed by God, and "ordained" anew, not by men, but "for men;" since its business is "in things pertaining to God," since the ministry of reconciliation is "given" by God, and by him "committed to" men, or "put in" men, and since it is an embassy from Christ. (Heb. v. 1. 2 Cor. v. 18, 19, 20.) *Such* an office must either be perpetuated or be lost: it cannot be renewed or changed, like the civil offices which are the creation of man. It is clear then from Scripture, that civil government, though of perpetual general obligation, is not so in any one of its kinds; while ecclesiastical polity is permanently binding in the form set forth in the New Testament.—3. It has been said, that the appointment of a king for *Israel* by the *Deity*, is an intimation of the divine will in favour of royal government, and that therefore that form of civil magistracy must be as binding as episcopacy. We reply, that *if* such an intimation of the divine will existed, it would unquestionably be binding on Christians. But this is not the fact. On the contrary, by the prophet Hosea, (xiii. 2.) God declares "I gave thee a king *in mine anger*." And the history of the affairs which led to the appointment of Saul shows, that it was human perverseness and ambition which insisted on having a king, while the Deity opposed it, and even "protested" against it. (1 Sam. viii. 5—20. See also the margin of verse 9.) This fact neutralizes, not only the inference in favour of royal government drawn from that case, but all other allegations of the kind pretending scriptural authority. This fact shows, indisputably, that God permits men to choose for themselves a form of *civil* government. Not till the Israelites had freely and even irreligiously declared for a monarchy, did the Almighty select the individual who should be their king. In forming, however, the government of the Christian *Church*, man was not even consulted; the ministry was appointed by Christ; its appointment was placed on record by the Holy Spirit; from that record we gather that its model was episcopacy: and this we think a sufficient intimation of the will of God that all Christians should conform to that model. The case of monarchical government is in no respect analogous with this.—4. Parity contradicts its own principles in raising objections to our argument from the precepts contained in Scripture to obey kings. Sound Presbyterians, as well as sound Episcopalians, believe that the ecclesiastical system delineated in Scripture is of permanent obligation. We both insist on ordination by succession from the Apostles. If this succession is broken, ordination becomes neither episcopal nor presbyterian, but, as we both affirm, of mere lay or human authority. Now, if Parity thus

Digitized by Google

claims perpetuity because it is said to be found in Scripture, yet rejects the perpetuity of kingly government, also found there, why should Episcopalians be censured for doing the very same in behalf of *their* system? The same arguments which Parity uses in regard to this point, Episcopalians may also use. If *its* friends are satisfied that "the king, as supreme," was a transient appointment, so are *we*. If they are satisfied, on the other hand, that the scriptural model of ecclesiastical polity is *not* a transient appointment, so again are we. The only question remaining is—*what* is the model of the ministry contained in Scripture? is it presbytery, or is it episcopacy? And this is the question which has been discussed, and we hope to purpose, in the foregoing essay.

NOTE H—PAGE 439.

That the duties of an Evangelist, as such, were of an itinerant missionary kind, is, so far as the scriptural evidence is concerned, merely *taken for granted*. This point is indeed of small moment in our controversy. But, as all errors have a tendency to dispose the mind to further perversions, we think the following corroborations of the position, that 'it is not to be presumed that an Evangelist was necessarily a missionary,' may be useful.

An old commentator, strongly anti-episcopal, speaks decidedly against the missionary functions of evangelists, and gives, in this respect, a just view of their duties, as deduced from Scripture only. "These were followers [*sectatores*, imitators] of the Apostles, and they sometimes *abode* [*subsistebant*] in a particular church, teaching and defending the Apostles' doctrine. Hence [the Scripture] often takes them for the [*ipso*] minister of the word, (the pastor, we presume, of some such particular church,) as in 2 Tim. iv. 'do the work of an evangelist,' that is, diligently and watchfully *teach*. Such also was Philip in Acts xxi." See ARETIUS on Ephes. iv. 11. It is obvious that this writer considered "evangelists" as rather settled than migratory teachers, and as being often proper pastors. Another reference will show this more fully. "Do the work of an evangelist, that is, faithfully teaching. I suppose an evangelist to mean one who was principally employed in preaching the gospel, yet was not an Apostle. For these (Apostles) with the highest authority of the HOLY SPIRIT, *travelled* hither and thither for the purpose of instituting and reforming [*instaurandi et reformandi*] churches, wherever a place was opened. But Evangelists, without [*citra*, on this side, short of,] the office of apostleship, *preached* to them (these churches) with the authority of the next; [office;] sometimes they presided over particular churches as Bishops (presbyter-bishops.) Such was Timothy, both an Evangelist and a Bishop." See ARETIUS on 2 Tim. iv. 5. Our author assigns travelling or missionary duty to the Apostles; he regards *them* as the founders and settlers of churches; but the functions of Evangelists he represents as chiefly of a preaching and pastoral kind.—We have made these quotations in aid of our assertion, that the missionary character of Evangelists ought not to be taken for granted. The author is wrong however in saying that no Evangelists were Apostles, since Timothy was both. He is also wrong in calling Timothy a presbyter-bishop. Our essay has settled these points.

Charles I., in his controversy, in the Isle of Wight, with the Presbyterian Divines, very soundly remarks—(p. 6.) "setting aside men's conjectures, you cannot make it appear by any text of *Scripture*, that the office of an Evangelist is such as you have described it. The work of an Evangelist which St. Paul exhorteth Timothy to do, seems by the context (2 Tim. iv. 5.) to be nothing but diligence in preaching the word, notwithstanding all impediments and oppositions." To this the Presbyterian Divines only allege the various recorded travels of Timothy and Titus. But these travels were common to

Digitized by Google

This book may be kept

them and the Apostles; and as much prove them to have held this latter office, as that of Evangelists.

MILNER (Vol. I. p. 56, 59) thinks that Philip, the Evangelist, *resided* in Cesarea twenty or thirty years, from the time he reached there after baptizing the Ethiopian, (Acts viii. 40.,) till Paul lodged at his house, as mentioned in Acts xxi. 8.

In fine: There is *no* scriptural proof that Evangelists, as such, were migratory or itinerant; nay, that sor' proof favours the opposite opinion, that they did *not* travel merely in the fulfilment of their evangelizing function. And we therefore assert, that, so far as appears from the inspired record, Timothy might have "done the work of an Evangelist," without being in any sense a missionary Bishop, but exclusively a diocesan. We say this, only because it is due to truth and accuracy, not because our argument requires it. That Timothy was a proper Bishop we have proved in the essay; and it is of no consequence whether he exercised that office as a missionary, or a diocesan, or both. It is expedient, probably in the highest degree, that every Bishop, whatever *extra* duties he may perform as a missionary, be a diocesan or coadjutor; but this is not essential. In the first founding of Christianity, the apostolical or episcopal labours of almost every individual in the office were necessarily diffused widely. Yet the docile student of Scripture will not fail to remark, that it *leaves* Timothy in Ephesus, Titus in Crete, and the seven "angels" *connected* with their respective Churches; to which the case of James is to be added, in the Church of Jerusalem. (Acts xv. 13, 19., xxi. 18.) Thus much may be securely claimed, in addition to the revealed argument for episcopacy in itself, in favour of *diocesan* arrangements.

THE END.

89097197867

B89097197867A

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

89097197867

b89097197867a

Digitized by Google